

5203. Also, petition of Joseph A. Kenny, New York City, favoring the passage of House bill 6983, to amend certain sections of the Federal farm loan act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5204. By Mr. ROMJUE: Petition of citizens of Schuyler County, Mo., asking for the passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

5205. By Mr. SLOAN: Petition of John F. Bergmeyer, and 84 others, Seventy-first Congress bills, S. 476 and H. R. 2562, providing for increased rates of pension to the men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

5206. By Mr. SNELL: Petition of New York State Farm Bureau Federation, urging Congress for the passage of the Capper-Ketcham bill now before Congress, which provides for increased Federal aid to States for the advancement of agriculture extension; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5207. By Mr. SWANSON: Petition of G. C. Bosen and 33 others, urging the passage of House bill 2562 for the relief of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

5208. By Mr. SWING: Petition of members of the men's Bible class of the First Presbyterian Church of San Diego, Calif., protesting against the efforts to break down the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5209. By Mr. WELCH of California: Petition of sundry citizens of San Francisco, Calif., urging the early enactment of the Lehlbach retirement bill and House bill 9446; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

5210. By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Petition of Patrick A. Connolly and several citizens of Brockton, Mass., urging the early passage of House bill 2562 providing for increased rates of pension to Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

5211. By Mr. WOLVERTON of West Virginia: Petition of Dr. E. R. Cooper, of Troy, Gilmer County, W. Va., and the Kanawha Medical Association, of Charleston, W. Va., opposing favorable action on the legislation proposed in House bills 9053, 9054; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5212. By Mr. WYANT: Petition of Herminie Council, No. 196, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, Herminie, Westmoreland County, Pa., advocating legislation to put Mexican immigration on a quota basis, to make The Star-Spangled Banner the official national anthem, and opposing the national-origins clause of the immigration law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5213. Also, petition of Rillton Grange, No. 1950, Rillton, Westmoreland County, Pa., indorsing debenture plan and opposing tariff on lumber, shingles, and other building materials used in construction of farm buildings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5214. By Mr. YON: Petition of M. M. Perriman, R. C. Sanford, B. F. Smith, H. F. Cotten, J. M. Smith, and John G. McClain, of Quincy, Gadsden County, Fla., urging the passage of House bill 2562 granting an increase of pension to Spanish-American War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

SENATE

SATURDAY, March 1, 1930

(Legislative day of Monday, January 6, 1930)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. GOFF obtained the floor.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to enable me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield for that purpose?

Mr. GOFF. I yield.

Mr. FESS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen	Copeland	Harris	McNary
Ashurst	Couzens	Harrison	Metcalf
Barkley	Cutting	Hatfield	Moses
Bingham	Deneen	Hawes	Norbeck
Black	Dill	Hayden	Norris
Blaine	Fess	Hebert	Nye
Bleuse	Fletcher	Heflin	Oddie
Borah	Frazier	Johnson	Overman
Bratton	George	Jones	Patterson
Brock	Glass	Kean	Phipps
Brookhart	Goff	Keyes	Pine
Capper	Gould	La Follette	Pittman
Caraway	Greene	McKellar	Ransdell
Connally	Hale	McMaster	Robinson, Ind.

Robison, Ky.
Sheppard
Shortridge
Simmons
Smith
Smoot

Stelwer
Stephens
Sullivan
Swanson
Thomas, Idaho
Thomas, Okla.

Trammell
Tydings
Vandenberg
Wagner
Walsh, Mass.
Walsh, Mont.

Waterman
Watson
Wheeler

Mr. FESS. I wish to announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] is unavoidably detained from the Senate. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] is necessarily detained from the Senate by illness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

I also desire to announce the necessary absence of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED], who are delegates from the United States to the Naval Arms Conference meeting in London, England.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of its business to-day the Senate shall take a recess until 11 o'clock Monday morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

INVESTIGATION OF COTTONSEED INDUSTRY (S. DOC. NO. 91)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolutions 136 and 147 (71st Cong., 1st sess.) a preliminary report regarding the commission's investigation of certain phases of the cottonseed industry, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

PETITION AND MEMORIAL

Mr. VANDENBERG presented a resolution adopted by the North Eastern Michigan Development Bureau, of Bay City, Mich., favoring the passage of the so-called Knutson bill, providing funds from the Federal Treasury for tree planting in the national forests, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. TYDINGS presented a resolution adopted by the Baltimore (Md.) Zionist District, protesting against any change in the existing calendar which would include a blank day or any other device by which the immemorially fixed periodicity of the Sabbath would be destroyed, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 564) for the relief of Josephine Laforge (Sage Woman) (Rept. No. 231); and

A bill (H. R. 565) for the relief of Clarence Stevens (Rept. No. 232).

Mr. BROOKHART, from the Committee on Claims, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 363) for the relief of Charles W. Martin (Rept. No. 233); and

A bill (S. 463) for the relief of the Gray Artesian Well Co. (Rept. No. 234).

REPORT OF POSTAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. PHIPPS, as in open executive session, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported sundry post-office nominations, which were placed on the Executive Calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 3777) granting an increase of pension to Ellah J. C. Perry (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 3778) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Tolbert (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

A bill (S. 3779) granting a pension to Mary E. Ewing (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 3780) for the relief of Llewellyn B. Griffith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A bill (S. 3781) for the relief of Philip T. Post; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FRAZIER (by request):

A bill (S. 3782) to permanently set aside certain public lands in Utah as an addition to the Western Navajo Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

A bill (S. 3783) for the relief of the State of Georgia for damage to and destruction of roads and bridges by floods in 1929; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. DENEEN:

A bill (S. 3784) for the relief of John Marks, alias John Bell; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 3785) granting a pension to Hannah Parthena Ramsey (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENT TO THE TARIFF BILL

Mr. HAYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 2667, the tariff revision bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

On page 135, to strike out lines 23 and 24; and on page 136, to strike out lines 1 and 2, and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

"PAR. 741. Dates, fresh or dried, with pits, 1 cent per pound; with pits removed, 2 cents per pound; any of the foregoing in packages weighing with the immediate container not more than 10 pounds each, 7½ cents per pound; prepared or preserved, not specially provided for, 35 per cent ad valorem."

THE FARM PROBLEM

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on February 20 there appeared in the Robertson County Times, Springfield, Tenn., an excellent article by Hon. Joel B. Fort on "What's the Matter With the Farmer and What's the Remedy?" It is an excellent contribution by a man who is a farmer himself. I commend it to a careful reading by Members of the Senate, and ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the Record as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATFIELD in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the Robertson County Times, Springfield, Tenn., February 20, 1930]

WHAT'S THE MATTER WITH THE FARMER, AND WHAT'S THE REMEDY?—CRY OF OVERPRODUCTION IS WEAPON OF BUYER USED WITH TELLING EFFECT

By Hon. Joel B. Fort

The farmer has been sick for many years. Many have been the doctors who have come to him with nostrums of varied kinds, and many who have diagnosed his case and sadly walked away.

Doctor Hoover diagnosed his case as "pernicious economic anemia," and the Congress gave him a Farm Board to administer the curative measures. When that Farm Board met, Doctor Hoover briefly addressed it and told the board that its first duty was to limit production of farm crops, that without this being done it were impossible to stabilize and control prices.

It seems to me that he was entirely wrong in his first piece of advice. He knew that the industrials could limit production, but he will not find a way which will enable the farmer to do so. How can such a thing be done? Can the farmer do it? If so, how? Limit the acreage as he insists? Why, the acreage is not a test as to the amount which may be produced. It may be too wet or it may be too dry for a good crop. Not acreage alone, nor scientific cultivation alone, can be considered to estimate the crop. Drought and flood, frost and heat, and many other conditions over which man has absolutely no control regulates the amount produced per acre. Then, too, the regularity and the properly adjusted labor question is ever present. Add to this that the soil is not as fresh and fertile as of old and innumerable diseases and insects keep the scientists always busy and the farmer at expense and labor to combat the same. The presence of all these enemies of the farm brings loss to the farmer, and he knows that there is no way at sowing time to know how bountiful the harvest will be at reaping time.

COOPERATION WITH THE FARM BOARD

The creation of the Farm Board and the appropriation of \$500,000,000 with which to aid cooperative organizations of the farmers can, and will be, in my opinion, of wonderful and lasting benefit to the farmer if he will get to work and organize. All of the cooperatives which the farmers have established in the past have had the disadvantage of having to fight the buyer and the nonmember, and had the onerous proposition of financing the organization. Under the Federal law he is relieved of this. The United States Government is behind this organization, will give prestige and standing in the markets of trade.

THE CRY OF OVERPRODUCTION

All my life the cry of overproduction has been the weapon of the buyer. He has used it with telling effect to beat down the price of the

farmer's produce. Every year as the wheat, cotton, and tobacco comes on the market you will see the buyer or his agent shaking his head and crying aloud, "Overproduction." All of my life I have wondered what became of this great surplus. None of it has been dumped in the ocean; none of it has failed to go into the used products of the world, and consequently we all know that it has been consumed.

The rush of crops to a market which can not handle it is ruinous to the producer and advantageous to the buyer. It has been bought by the speculator and held till the demand comes. The Farm Board was created to stabilize prices of farm products, and in order to do so it is given the money to buy, or advance to cooperatives money to hold the products until the manufacturer is in need of them.

It was not created to limit production. It can not do that. It was created to stabilize prices. It was created to establish a price for farm products which will yield a fair profit to the farmer.

Didn't the Government fix a fair return for the railroads, and do you hear the railroads complain, save to the Government? This being so, why can't the Farm Board say that 20 cents is a fair price for cotton, \$1.50 a fair price for wheat, and establish a fair average price for tobacco, and advance that price to the cooperative or buy it? That would set the price and the outsider and the man in the organization would get the same. It will not take long for this Farm Board to drop the cry of limitation of acreage, and know that they can stabilize the prices by taking into storage the crops at the rush season and hold until they are needed.

Egypt of old learned this and provided granaries to hold food against the shortage which came from the failure of the Nile to flood the valley.

The sympathy which has been so generously given by every trade or profession for all this half century or more, and which has fooled the farmers for all these years, will work no longer. The cry of the South for equality with the industrials was earnest and long, but had no help but the sympathy from the industrial sections of the country. Then when the "sons of the wild jackasses from the West" came out and joined the South, then and not till then did the industrials, and the 40,000 millionaires, come out and say to the 7,000,000 farmers, "we will place you on a parity with the industrials."

WHAT HAS SYMPATHY DONE FOR THE FARMER?

For more than a half century the Government of the United States, the several States, the counties, and the municipalities, have appropriated money lavishly for the encouragement of farming. It was by all admitted to be the basic industry, and tears were shed (crocodile tears though they were) for the poor struggling farmer. Experts were employed to go into every nook and corner and teach the farmer to farm. Ah! The farmless farmer teaching the dirt farmer how to raise more crops, while along the streets of the county seat of every county walked the buyer for the trust baron, yelling at the top of his voice, "Overproduction, overproduction." What do you think of that? What became of the overproduction during all those years? Can't you see some of it scattered among the 40,000 millionaires? Who has carried the burden? Who has had no equality in the buying and selling during all the time that crop of millionaires were incubating? It was proclaimed aloud by the President in his last campaign, and is echoed in the law creating the Farm Board.

Well, not only has the farmer been taught how to farm, but he has had science and chemistry at work in his behalf. Insecticides, and treatment of animal disease, and aids too numerous to mention.

It has been easy to have any and all kinds of appropriations to aid the farmer. In less than 10 years the appropriation for the farmer by the United States Government has increased from \$30,000,000 (exclusive of appropriations for public roads) to \$75,000,000.

The State of Tennessee has increased its appropriations to \$346,124.07 in 1929 from less than half that amount in less than 10 years. The counties have appropriated large sums also, and from all of this expenditure of money, what is the condition of the farmer to-day? More than 75 per cent of the farms are under mortgage. The farm-loan department of the Federal Government has not been able to collect the interest, and Senator SMITH is moving to have the rate of interest lowered. To hear the farm advocates in the Senate discuss the matter one must know that in a few years the foreclosures by the insurance companies and other land-loan companies will become a menace.

THE MECHANICAL MAN

The introduction of improved machinery into the farm operation has reduced the amount of man and mule labor and has not yet so adjusted itself as to be as economical as it will be in the future.

The farmer has not yet adjusted himself to the change. The mechanical man has increased in cost twofold and more. A self-binder is now more than twofold its former price. Every plowpoint, every bolt, and every part of this mechanical man has increased the cost of farming more than twofold. Why is this?

Low wages on the farm has driven the boy from the farm. The cry of "back to the farm" is heard no more. Even the instructor in agriculture can not longer tell of profits on the farm. Doctor Dyer no longer sings of profits, but tells of what an Eden the farm is on which to raise a large family of children. What inducement is there for a boy to go to the farm when his dollar earned on the farm is only worth in

purchasing power 63 cents as against the street sweeper's dollar, which is worth a dollar in purchasing power? Don't you think the story as given here is a harrowing tale of injustice? Why should the basic industry on which all life and comfort is dependent be so humiliated by poverty? Why should the farmer be so handicapped?

WHO FIXES THE PRICE OF THE FARMER'S PRODUCTS?

Does supply and demand set the price of the farmer's crops and of his livestock? Who says so? At 10 o'clock each day the price of livestock is fixed in Chicago. Is there a farmer present with the five big packers? The packers fix the price and take the shipments, put the purchase in cold storage, and sell at will. When the farmer's stock is ready for market he is compelled to sell at the price on day of sale. What has he to do with the manipulation of the cotton or tobacco prices? Don't you think it is time the United States Government was giving a little aid to the farmer, to prevent the ruinous encroachment of the trust-protected buyer from further despoiling the basic industry of the country? We will await the action of the newly created Farm Board and hope that it will bring the long-promised relief. All the farmer asks is to be placed on an equal footing with the protected industrial institutions.

It is true that the farmer pays no land tax to the Government, but what the protected trust does to him on what he buys or is forced to buy in a closed market is enough to destroy hope in every farmer in our land. Until a short time ago the farmer and the real-estate holder paid practically all the tax for the upkeep of State, county, and municipality. No one saw anything else to tax except real estate, until Governor Peay came and revolutionized the governmental affairs of Tennessee. It is admitted that farms are not paying; it is admitted that farm lands are heavily mortgaged, and the farmer in debt. Why, then, should he bear the burden of State and county taxation? We have a home-building society organized for a glorious purpose. Organized to increase and encourage every man to own his own home? Why, then, tax a home? Why levy a tax on an institution which is purifying the citizenship? Why tax a home when it is the sacred circle from which radiates love into the whole world? The real estate and farm land tax is archaic and ought to go.

WHAT IS THE REMEDY?

"If the farmers would stay at home and work as hard as the business men in the city do, and quit buying automobiles and radios, they would not have all this debt hanging over them," said an old business man a few days ago. Some years ago Col. W. X. W. Pepper, of Springfield, answered an advertisement, "How to get rich quick." He sent the fee, and in a short time received the answer. In an envelope was a card across which in large letters was printed the following: "Work like hell, and save all you make."

Is that the way the old business man feels? Is that the way the world feels toward the farmer? Will some one tell why a farmer's labor should not receive as much or more reward than a street sweeper or a worker in an industrial plant? Does anyone want the man who does the work for the basic industry of our Government to be reduced to serfdom? Why should not the farmer own and operate his own automobile, when the workers in the shoe factories and all other industrial plants ride to their work in an automobile? He needs a radio in his home away out on the hill more than does a city dweller. What has he done for this country that he should be given the butt end of life? How far do we get in the halls of the great of our country before we see the statue of a farmer's boy who went to the front and made his name in the annals of history? Go out among the men of affairs, and soon you hear the story of one who has made the world move on and up: "I was born down on the farm."

Away with your cry of overproduction! Away with the notion that you must have a "farmless" day now and then in order to prevent a surplus! Away with the idea of having an "acreless" year now and then in order to fight the phantom of overproduction, which never comes except in aid of the trust buyer! We have been through all of those "eatless" days, those "wheatless" days, and now we want action from the National Farm Board that will in a sane and businesslike way give the farmer relief, which he richly deserves, and place him on an equality with the industrial and the worker for the industrial plant, which lives on his product of the soil. Take from him the tax burden which rests on his poverty and place it on him who hath. Stay the hand of the tax gatherer from him who hath not and show him the way to the door of him who hath.

Give him that equality which has so long been promised and justice will have been done. He has had enough of sympathy; he has had enough of hope, and well might the lines of the great philosopher poet be paraphrased to read:

"Hope springs eternal in the human breast,
The farmer always is, but never to be blest."

The farmer has been patient, he has been hopeful, he has accepted long-delayed promises, until patience ceases to become a virtue, and now if the Farm Board fails to do substantial work in the promise of

equality, we may again hear the braying of the "sons of the wild jackasses of the West," much to the discomfort of the father of the "farmless" day and the "acreless" year.

REVISION OF THE TARIFF

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2667) to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, to protect American labor, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT: Are there any further amendments relating to oil or oil products? Apparently not. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Goff] has the floor.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. President, I rise in defense of the American protective-tariff policy, which apparently has sunk so low in the United States Senate that there are few to do it honor. I feel that this apparent indifference toward a protective tariff is more the result of a lack of understanding of the supreme importance of a protective tariff to the economic structure of this country than it is the result of malice. Some thousands of years ago there was a great famine in Egypt, and the food administrator of the day was a young Jew, famous in history as the interpreter of the dreams of Pharaoh, which had foretold the famine. This young Jew, it will be remembered, was an outcast from his family as a result of envy, jealousy, and hatred on the part of his brothers. It will be remembered that his brothers, 10 of them, were sent by their father, Jacob, to buy corn from their brother Joseph, the food administrator of Egypt.

And Joseph knew his brethren, but they knew not him.

On the subject of the tariff, Mr. President, we are a generation of "know-not Josephs." Thirty-six years ago this month—March—the last effective low tariff bill was reported to this body, and on August 28, 1894, the ill-timed and ill-fated Wilson-Gorman Act went into operation. It lasted only three years, but those three years are three of the darkest years in our economic history. Scores of our railroads went into receivership, thousands of our industries failed, and out of the hundreds of thousands of idle workers in the United States, Coxey recruited an army which marched on Washington demanding that something be done to relieve the distress. That was thirty-odd years ago, and I recite here these principal features of those times in order to remind my colleagues and all of those within the sound of my voice what happened in this country the last time we compromised with the policy of protection. We learned that lesson, and apparently learned it well, for it was almost 20 years before we harkened again to the teachings of the free trader and the tariff-for-revenue-only theorists; but this we did again in 1913, when we passed the Underwood-Simmons law, which has to its distinction, among other things, the placing of 40 of the principal agricultural crops of the country on the free list, and the drastic reduction in the tariff on scores of other products of the farm. But the greatest catastrophe of all times saved us from our folly, for nine months after we passed the Underwood-Simmons law the Great War broke out in Europe, and for the next five years, we had, in effect, not only a prohibitive tariff but actually an embargo on competitive imports into the United States.

Thus it happened that in 1913, we were saved a repetition of the disastrous consequences which followed certain and swift upon our last previous compromise with protection 36 years ago.

Now, Mr. President, 36 years is a long time in the memory of man. A man 50 years old to-day was a school boy of 14 when the Wilson-Gorman law was passed. And there is at least one Member of this body who had not yet seen the light of day in 1894. So it happens, Mr. President, that on the tariff we are a generation of "know-not Josephs," but why should we be? The lessons of 1894 are in our history books for those who will but read them, and so, too, are the records which tell what happened every time in the last 100 years of our history when we have abandoned the policy of adequate protection for our industries and our labor. In 1833 we passed the so-called compromise tariff act, and during the 10 years which followed, the business annals of this country record three panics, with depression the chronic state of business activity. In 1857 we did it again, and within six months of the passage of the tariff law of March 3, 1857, we had one of the most ruinous panics in our history. Then came the tariff act of 1894, to which, Mr. President, I shall make only one further reference. I would quote here the prophecy and the hope of a distinguished Democratic Member of the lower House who apparently regarded the Wilson law as at least the equal of one of nature's own dicta. Here is his expression of the hope and the promise which were to follow the passage of that tariff law:

The passage of the bill will mark the dawn of a brighter day, with more of sunshine, more of the songs of birds, more of that sweetest music, the laughter of children well fed, well clothed, well housed. Can we doubt that in the brighter, happier days to come good, even-handed, wholesome Democracy shall be triumphant? God hasten the era of equality in taxation and in opportunity! And God prosper the Wilson bill * * *

What a prophecy that was, Mr. President! And what a travesty in the light of the dismal failure of the Wilson-Gorman law!

Mr. President, I make no apology for going back 36 years in our history to remind my colleagues of the consequences which followed our last effective compromise with the protective-tariff principle. It is fortunate, indeed, for the country that I must needs go back 36 years for this last great object lesson, for it means that during these 36 years our economic development has been permitted to continue without the stifling, the withering, the deadly hampering and hindrance of an inadequate protective tariff.

I come now to the situation at the end of the Great War. The Underwood-Simmons law was still in force, but largely ineffective because of the demoralized condition of foreign industries. That such demoralization, however, would not long continue was appreciated by every thinking man and woman at that time, and whoever doubted it needed only to look at the increase in our imports between 1918 and 1920, when, in two years, they rose from \$3,000,000,000 to over \$5,250,000,000. In recognition of all this, Congress in 1920 passed emergency tariff legislation to help stem the rising tide of imports, particularly of agricultural imports, and in the closing days, almost the closing hours, of his administration, Woodrow Wilson vetoed that bill. The Republican Congress which assembled after the 4th of March, 1921, immediately reenacted this legislation, and in May, 1921, the emergency tariff act became law. That this law filled at least partially the crying need for an increased tariff on the products of the farm, I believe no one will now dispute. There is an abundance of evidence now available to support the statement that the Republican emergency tariff act of 1921 was the first definite move made to help relieve the agricultural distress of 10 years ago.

Seventeen months after the emergency law was passed the Fordney-McCumber Act went into operation. Probably no American tariff law in our history has more completely confounded its critics than has the act of 1922. It was denounced by the opposition and its critics as one of the worst, if not the worst, tariff law in our history. It was said that it would bring ruin to our industries, unemployment to our workers, and, I believe, it was suggested that it would probably be the cause of the wrecking of the Republican Party. All of these things, I seem to recall, were to happen because the act of 1922 would be like a Chinese trade wall around our country, shutting out all imports and thereby destroying our foreign trade. I need not enlarge upon the absurdity of these predictions, Mr. President; the record of the last seven years gives them the lie more effectively than I could hope to do. On only one of these pessimistic predictions would I say anything further. Whereas for the year 1922 our imports amounted to \$3,113,000,000, for the year 1929 our imports reached the enormous total of \$4,400,000,000. And this, be it remembered, Mr. President, has all happened under the operation of the law which it was supposed would prohibit imports into this country.

In the main, then, the tariff law of 1922 has worked well, considering the circumstances surrounding its passage, but as time went on, beginning with 1924 and 1925, it became increasingly apparent that there were certain inadequacies in the act of 1922 in the light of the restoration of the economic conditions in the rest of the world. It will be recalled by those who followed the making of the tariff act of 1922, that time after time in the public hearings held by the committees of Congress, the representatives of American industries frankly admitted that they did not know what rates were necessary in order approximately to equal the differences between foreign and American costs. The Great War had so completely upset the old pre-war standards of difference that no one could tell what these differences were going to be as soon as the industries of Europe began to come back. The situation was further complicated by the debased currencies in most of the principal countries of Europe, from which our most ruinous competition has always come. Thus, there were no trustworthy standards to go by in 1921 and 1922, and we endeavored to meet the difficulty by going back in a great many instances to the old Payne-Aldrich rates of 1909. This, it developed, was a mistake; these rates in the act of 1909 were inadequate standards, and as I mentioned above, beginning in 1924, numerous rates in

both the agricultural and industrial schedules of the act of 1922 began to be inadequate. Furthermore, the interpretation by the Treasury Department and the customs courts of various provisions in the Fordney-McCumber law resulted in a considerable weakening of the legislative intent to pass a measure which would protect American producers and safeguard their home market.

To meet these conditions, the Republican platform in 1928 pledged the party to a revision of the tariff; and within a month after the elections of a year ago tariff revision was announced. But before considering in some detail this revision now going on, I desire to refer to certain other facts which are a part of the record of the last political campaign.

First, I would call attention to certain parts of the tariff pledge in the Republican platform for 1928. This pledge, after "reaffirming our belief in the protective tariff as a fundamental and essential principle of the economic life of this Nation," goes on to say:

However, we realize that there are certain industries which can not now successfully compete with foreign producers because of lower foreign wages and a lower cost of living abroad, and we pledge the next Republican Congress to an examination and, where necessary, a revision of these schedules to the end that American labor in these industries may again command the home market, may maintain its standard of living, and may count upon steady employment in its accustomed field.

Adherence to that policy is essential for the continued prosperity of the country. Under it, the standard of living of the American people has been raised to the highest levels ever known. Its example has been eagerly followed by the rest of the world, whose experts have repeatedly reported with approval the relationship of this policy to our prosperity, with the resultant emulation of that example by other nations.

A protective tariff is as vital to American agriculture as it is to American manufacturing. The Republican Party believes that the home market, built up under the protective policy, belongs to the American farmers, and it pledges its support of legislation which will give this market to him to the full extent of his ability to supply it. Agriculture derives large benefits, not only directly from the protective duties levied on competitive farm products of foreign origin, but also indirectly from the increase in the purchasing power of American workmen employed in industries similarly protected. These benefits extend to persons engaged in trade, also transportation, and other activities.

Two weeks after the Republican Party adopted the platform containing this tariff pledge, the Democratic Party, at its convention in Houston, Tex., adopted a tariff plank pledging itself first and foremost to—

the maintenance of legitimate business and a high standard of wages for American labor.

More and more as the campaign which followed these conventions progressed the tariff became a dominant issue. The principal speeches of both presidential candidates emphasized its importance; and in this emphasis, Mr. President, it almost seemed as though the Democratic Party had abandoned its traditional low-tariff position and was standing for a tariff which would, in its candidate's own words—

to the very limit protect legitimate business enterprises as well as American labor from ruinous competition of foreign-made goods produced under conditions far below the American standard.

The two principal tariff speeches made by President Hoover during the campaign were made at Newark, N. J., and at Boston, Mass. In his Newark speech the President gave first place to the protective tariff among those policies which make for security and continuous employment for the American worker. On this I quote from the President's Newark speech:

The first of our policies which have given security and expansion of employment has been the enactment of the protective tariff. The protective tariff has been a fundamental policy of the Republican Party ever since the party was founded. Against it the Democratic Party has battled for these same 70 years. Two months ago their platform hinted that they thought we might be right. However, they declared for a tariff that would maintain effective competition. That must mean a tariff which will maintain effective competition of foreign against American goods. That is not protection. That this is the meaning is borne out by references to the Underwood tariff of the last Democratic administration as the ideal. The reenactment of that tariff would let in a flood of foreign goods, destroy employment and lower wages, and demoralize our farmers all over the United States. I would suggest that the employees of industries in New Jersey and the country should directly investigate as to what would happen to their employment with lowered tariffs.

Again in Boston the President declared:

One of the most important economic issues of this campaign is the protective tariff. The Republican Party has for 70 years supported a tariff designed to give adequate protection to American labor, American industry, and the American farm against foreign competition.

And I think, too, the conclusion of the President's Boston speech is worthy of reference here:

Now, let me sum up the thought I should like to leave with you. I have talked to you about the tariff, about international trade, the merchant marine, and other economic forces which may, at first glance, seem far removed from our daily lives. I have tried to make the point that these subjects are no longer remote from any one of you.

The time may have been, as some one once said, when the tariff was a local issue of foreign trade, and shipping concerned only the local seaports. It is so no longer. Touch the tariff on textiles and North Carolina feels the blighting influence as quickly as Massachusetts. Nor does it stop there. The farmer finds a diminished market in the lessened demand caused by lower wages.

Meanwhile Governor Smith, the Democratic nominee, was promising the people that if successful the Democratic Party would sponsor no tariff legislation that would "take a 5-cent piece out of the pay envelope" of any workingman; and in that I quote the exact language of the Democratic candidate for the presidency.

Feeling, perhaps, that such a new-found and far-fetched assertion on the part of a Democratic nominee for the Presidency might be in need of considerable support and proof, the chairman of the Democratic National Committee sent a telegram to Democratic Senators and Representatives and Democratic candidates for office requesting their indorsement of Democracy's new-found protective program as outlined by Governor Smith. Commenting on this phase of the 1928 campaign, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL] on this floor on November 1, 1929, said:

To this telegram 24 Democratic Senators and 115 Representatives now holding office in the upper and lower Halls of Congress replied favorably, granting the permission requested. The Senators sitting on this side of the Chamber who wired unqualified approval of the principles outlined in that message are:

HENRY F. ASHURST, Arizona; ALBEN W. BARKLEY, Kentucky; EDWIN S. BROUSSARD, Louisiana; T. H. CARAWAY, Arkansas; ROYAL S. COPELAND, New York; C. C. DILL, Washington; DUNCAN U. FLETCHER, Florida; WALTER F. GEORGE, Georgia; CARL HAYDEN, Arizona; PAT HARRISON, Mississippi; HARRY B. HAWES, Missouri; WILLIAM J. HARRIS, Georgia; WILLIAM H. KING, Utah; LEE S. OVERMAN, North Carolina; KEY PITTMAN, Nevada; JOSEPH E. RANDELL, Louisiana; JOSEPH T. ROBINSON, Arkansas; H. D. STEPHENS, Mississippi; MORRIS SHEPPARD, Texas; MILLARD E. TYDINGS, Maryland; T. J. WALSH, Montana; BURTON K. WHEELER, Montana; DAVID I. WALSH, Massachusetts; ROBERT F. WAGNER, New York.

Apparently, Mr. President, there was at least one "doubting Thomas" among us to whom these Democratic tariff promises failed to carry conviction. It will be recalled that the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]—I am sorry he is not in the Chamber—took what I think might be called an active part in the campaign of 1928; and I believe it is no exaggeration to say that of all of us he probably gave most time and thought to an analysis of the Democratic campaign promises. Four days before the election, Mr. President, and after he had undoubtedly given much serious thought to the Democratic campaign promises, the Senator from Idaho made a speech in Boston in which he said, in part:

Now, my friends, there is nothing more vital in the closing hours of this campaign than the preservation of the policy upon which the industries of this country have been built up and the standard of wages has been built up. Let us keep it in the hands of those who have believed in it from the beginning. Let us intrust it to those who are not in danger of having any lapse of mind after the election. What we want, my friends, in the next four years is a policy which will undoubtedly and effectively protect American labor and American industries against the inroads which may come from Europe both in manufactured goods and in labor.

Here in summary are what are to me certain outstanding tariff occurrences in the campaign of 1928, which resulted in what history will record as a Republican victory. Now, I submit, Mr. President, that on the basis of these tariff incidents in the 1928 campaign a fair-minded man would have been led to conclude, first, that we were going to have a tariff revision, and second, that such revision would be a protective revision. I see no other possible interpretation from the campaign promises of both parties but particularly from the promises of the Republican Party, and I challenge anyone to dispute this viewpoint.

Now, let us see what has happened since January a year ago.

Early in December, 1928, the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives sent out a notice of tariff hearings to begin on January 6, 1929, and the opening words of this notice said that these hearings were "preliminary to general tariff revision." In answer to the call of the Ways and Means Committee an army of witnesses came to Washington and testified at the tariff hearings which that committee held during January and February a year ago. On May 7, 1929, the proposed new tariff law was introduced in the House; out of about 2,700 rates in the present law, the Hawley bill increased about 900—of which almost half related to agriculture—and decreased about 60 rates, leaving some 1,700 unchanged. Now, Mr. President, it was while the Ways and Means Committee was in executive session that the Congress met in special session in answer to the President's call. And it was on April 15 when I heard the President's message read to the special session that I first heard the term "limited revision." Let us refer, Mr. President, to those portions of the President's message which are pertinent in this connection:

An effective tariff upon agricultural products that will compensate the farmer's high costs and higher standards of living has a dual purpose. Such a tariff not only protects the farmer in our domestic market, but it also stimulates him to diversify his crops and to grow products that he could not otherwise produce, and thus lessens his dependence upon exports to foreign markets. The great expansion of production abroad under the conditions I have mentioned renders foreign competition in our export markets increasingly serious.

In considering the tariff for other industries than agriculture we find that there have been economic shifts, necessitating a readjustment of some of the tariff schedules. Seven years of experience under the tariff bill enacted in 1922 have demonstrated the wisdom of Congress in the enactment of that measure. On the whole, it has worked well. In the main our wages have been maintained at high levels; our exports and imports have steadily increased; with some exceptions, our manufacturing industries have been prosperous.

Nevertheless, economic changes have taken place during that time which have placed certain domestic products at a disadvantage and new industries have come into being, all of which creates the necessity for some limited changes in the schedules and in the administrative clauses of the laws as written in 1922.

It would seem to me that the test of necessity for revision is, in the main, whether there has been a substantial slackening of activity in an industry during the past few years and a consequent decrease of employment due to insurmountable competition in the products of that industry. It is not as if we were setting up a new basis of protective duties. We did that seven years ago. What we need to remedy now is whatever substantial loss of employment may have resulted from shifts since that time.

Thus it happens, Mr. President, that the limited-revision notion which has been so widely advertised did not make its appearance in the thought of Congress until after the House hearings "preliminary to general tariff revision" were long since over; not until after the Ways and Means Committee had completed six weeks of work on the proposed new law, and not until three weeks before the proposed new law was made public in printed form.

I recite the circumstances which antedated the appearance of the proposition of limited revision primarily for the benefit of those who seek to read into the term "limited" the proposition that all changes to be made in the present revision shall be confined to one particular schedule.

It is a curious fact that the advocates of this proposition apparently believe they have their strongest supporting argument in those very sections of the President's message which I have quoted above. I recall having heard it said on the floor of this Chamber by certain of the distinguished Members included in the so-called coalition that we were exceeding our authority in going over the whole tariff bill, when by the President's message we were called together in special session for the express purpose of undertaking a "limited" revision of the tariff. Parenthetically, I am sure the President will find great consolation in the stamp of approval placed on his "limited-revision" suggestion by various members of the coalition. Here, indeed, must be a bright spot to him in the record of the past year. However sorely he may have been tried by the ruthless opposition and the furious antagonism which has greeted most of his suggestions, here, indeed, is an oasis in which his mind can find refreshment in its contemplation of his first year's relations with the Senate of the United States. Here is a single suggestion for which he may justly claim authorship which met with the approval of the Senate coalition. Here is a presidential proposal which has actually been held up by various members of the coalition as the standard by which our actions should be governed and controlled. But, Mr. President, perhaps we go too

fast and too far. The President's message says with regard to the industrial schedules of the tariff:

Nevertheless, economic changes have taken place during that time which have placed certain domestic products at a disadvantage, and new industries have come into being which creates the necessity for some limited changes in the schedules and in the administrative clauses of the laws as written in 1922.

The President, in other words, suggests that the industrial schedules need an examination and, wherever necessary, a correction. This is concretely sound and constructively true in any economic aspect. He goes further. He says—I quote from the special message:

It would seem to me that the test of necessity for revisions is, in the main, whether there has been a substantial slackening of activity in an industry during the past few years, and a consequent decrease of employment due to insurmountable competition in the products of that industry.

I indorse all that President Hoover here says, and I am in hearty accord with all that he expressly and impliedly suggests.

That was in April; and let us turn now to a development of almost exactly two months later, always keeping in mind, if you please, sir, the approbation which the Senate coalition has accorded the President's limited-revision suggestion. On the morning of June 13, at a public hearing before the Senate Finance Committee on the revision of the tariff, the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] offered a resolution proposing that the committee confine its attention to the tariff on agricultural products. This was defeated by a vote of 11 to 7, and I notice from the records that the junior Senator from Massachusetts was absent. Then what happened? Why, the senior Senator from Idaho offered practically the same resolution from the floor of the Senate that same afternoon. Here it is, the now famous Borah resolution, sponsored by our distinguished colleague who, four days before the elections of 1928, pleaded with the voters in the great industrial State of Massachusetts to make sure they kept their tariff in safe hands for the next four years. I quote the resolution:

Whereas it is the sense of the Senate that any amendment to the existing tariff law should be confined to agriculture and directly related products: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance is hereby instructed to limit its hearings, deliberations, recommendations, and report upon H. R. 2667—the tariff bill—to the agricultural and directly related schedules.

Apparently the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] thought he saw in this a violation of the purpose for which the Congress was convened in special session by the President, and so he moved to amend the Borah resolution by adding to it the following language taken almost verbatim from the President's message:

And any other line of industry in which there is and has been during the past few years a substantial slackening of activity, with a consequent decrease of employment, due to insurmountable competition from imports of the products of such industry.

But by this addition on the part of the Senator from Washington the whole effect and purpose of the Borah resolution was immediately destroyed. The amendment as modified by the Senator from Washington would have meant a study on the Finance Committee's part of the various industrial schedules in the tariff law in order to determine what readjustments in the industrial rates were necessary—necessary, Mr. President, by the 1928 tariff pledge of the Republican Party, and necessary, too, Mr. President, under the terms of President Hoover's message calling the special session together. But who cares about a campaign pledge after the elections are over? Who cares about a message from the President unless it suits his purpose? I will answer, Mr. President, and I will answer by the single statement that the coalition defeated the Borah resolution with the Jones amendment, and they defeated it, Mr. President, because it was contrary to their purpose.

Then, Mr. President, we took a vote on the original Borah resolution, and, marvel of the year 1929, the Borah resolution was defeated by one vote. But this defeat in no way can destroy or minimize the fact that 38 Members of this Senate voted to disregard the tariff needs of industry, that 38 United States Senators voted for a resolution which has all the earmarks and all the characteristics of class legislation—of legislation for one economic group in this country.

The record also shows, Mr. President, that 6 other Members of this Chamber were paired in favor of the resolution, so that 44 Members of this body would have made the proposed new tariff law an instrument of class legislation.

It is too bad to have to record all this here, Mr. President. I regret it particularly for the sake of President Hoover, who will find no balm in Gilead in the real attitude of the coalition toward the one suggestion he has made to which they have paid lip service only, and to which they have from time to time given the stamp of their approval—the approval of hypocrites, the approval of a Brutus, plotting all the while to tear down and destroy. What fools we were in June, 1929, not to see the handwriting upon the wall. What fools we were not to have seen it in January, 1928, when the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McMASTER] introduced a resolution calling for an immediate reduction in the industrial rates of the present tariff law. Fifty-four Senators voted for that resolution two years ago, as against 34 voting in opposition to a plan which would inevitably have meant a serious blow to American industry.

To me, Mr. President, the debate and the discussion on that resolution as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are shameful. Sectionalism was the dominant note. Not in recent years, in my opinion, has the "bloody shirt" been hoisted higher or waved more vigorously. The whole discussion on the part of the proponents of the McMaster resolution was an attempt to array the so-called agricultural West against the industrial East, and as such, Mr. President, I denounce it with every ounce of strength I possess. I stand here as great a friend of the American farmer as any Member of the Senate, and I deny that the interests of the farmer can be improved by the destruction or dislocation of industry. In fact, Mr. President, I make so bold, in the light of the actions of this body during the last several months, as to say that the interests of industry, of labor, and of agriculture are so interlocked and bound up together that any injury to industry will indirectly, but none the less surely, be a calamity for the American farmer. And I believe that the American farmer knows that almost self-evident truth; in fact, the recent appeals to this body which have come from the farmers and their spokesmen are all the evidence I feel it necessary to produce to substantiate my claim that any action by this body which throws men out of work in our iron, steel, and glass industries means a decreased market and consequent lower prices for the American farmers.

Certainly it ought not be necessary for such an elementary discussion in this body, but I submit, Mr. President, that on December 10 it apparently was necessary for a considerable group of newspaper editors in the States of Minnesota, Iowa, North and South Dakota to address an open communication to the Senate of the United States emphasizing these self-evident economic truths. It is my honest conviction, Mr. President, that these newspaper representatives actually reflected public opinion in their communities, and I would digress here long enough to read into the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues certain highly significant paragraphs taken from the Statement to Congress by Editors of Rural Newspapers in Minnesota. Here they are:

We do not believe the tariff bill should now be held up indefinitely to slash the industrial rates of the 1922 law, as it will be delayed if there is an attempt to make indiscriminate changes. There would be delays not only in the Senate, but in the House, and especially in the conference committee.

Aside from these considerations, however, we want industrial labor to be prosperous. The workers of the industrial centers are our best customers. We want them to be employed, busy, and able to buy. Any considerable unemployment would affect us almost as quickly as it would affect them.

We know that the business structure of the country is based largely on tariff protection; that the structure has been in process of building for many years, and that business is adjusted to it.

We have noted how industrial tariff lashing in times past has invariably brought depression and unemployment. We do not want that condition to recur, because many of our products are already dangerously near saturation point as regards consumption.

We must increase the market demand for our products, and there is no better or more certain way to increase that demand than to safeguard the prosperity of the country, especially those parts of the country where demand is normally the greatest.

In short, we are better off with good customers paying us higher prices for the products we sell every day and every week, even if we must forego slight reductions in the prices of what we much less often buy from them.

This communication to the Congress was followed within a week by two other public communications. The one was a full-page newspaper advertisement "sponsored by 76 farm organizations" and called "An Open Letter to American Industry from 2,000,000 Farmers." The other was a similar newspaper advertisement paid for by the Minneapolis Tribune, of Minneapolis,

Minn. The keynote of the first was, "Parity for agriculture means billions for industry," and the dominant note in the second was, "Industrial prosperity depends upon agriculture." To these propositions I subscribe wholeheartedly and without a single reservation. I favor economic equality for the farmer, for I know that a prosperous agriculture is as necessary for industry as is a prosperous industry necessary for American agriculture, and I challenge anyone to show from the record that I have not done everything in my power to further this great purpose.

Now, both of these appeals to the Congress hinted at delay—delay in the passage of this tariff bill, on which the Congress has been engaged since January, a year ago. And, Mr. President, there has been delay, shameful, wasteful, and unnecessary delay, and at whose doorstep rests the fault that after 14 months of almost continuous and uninterrupted activity the passage of this proposed new tariff act, even such as it is, is not yet in immediate sight? I propose in my own time to answer that question, and I shall answer it with words out of the mouth of the coalition's greatest orator.

I left off with my chronological development of what has been going on here with the defeat of the Borah resolution last June. What happened next? The Finance Committee conducted its hearings in the usual manner, and in the light of the information secured at these hearings reported its revision of the House bill to this body on September 4, 1929. And what did we do? Thanks to a flank movement by the coalition, we threw orderly procedure and precedent out of the window, we sidetracked consideration of the industrial schedules, which come first in the bill, and we took up the administrative provisions, which come last. I know now why that was done, Mr. President, and I thought I knew something about it at the time.

The announcement early in September that the powers that be in the Senate had agreed to a plan under which the administrative sections of the tariff bill would be taken up first caused scarcely any comment and aroused no particular interest. Only the wise men saw its significance, and only they saw the disastrous consequences which would surely result from such a move.

And why? Consider the situation which led up to the agreement to reverse the usual order of taking up first that which comes first. Confusion and disagreement prevailed in the Democratic camp. They were getting nowhere on a plan of attack against the proposed new law. With the reconvening of the Senate, following its summer recess, the press reports indicated that a whole series of conferences by Democratic chieftains broke up in indecision. This was also reflected in the tariff debate, which began with an utter lack of any well-designed campaign of opposition. This failure to agree was strikingly reflected in many of the opening addresses made by the Democratic opposition.

And why? First, there is the clash of principles between the viewpoints of the old-time Democratic free traders and those less venerable sons of Democracy with a tendency to stray from the faith so often disastrous to their party's prospects. Then, second, there is scarcely a Democratic Representative or Senator in Washington whose home district does not have an American industry employing American labor that looks to him to prevent its ruin from unfair foreign competition. Hence too vigorous an opposition to the protective policy by these statesmen may carry with it the untimely end of their political careers; and so there was no enthusiasm on their part to damn the new tariff bill and to throw themselves wholeheartedly into a fight to defeat it.

The result was confusion, backing and filling and stalling for time; and then came the agreement to take up the administrative features first. That settled the confusion, uncertainty, and indecision. Here was a code of working rules vital to the successful operation of the law which, unfortunately, are so complicated in many instances that the layman voter back home can not understand them. Here were fundamental principles and policies of successful tariff administration which, by skillful maneuvering, could be divorced from the theory of protection. And last, but far from least, here was no catalogue of commodities and rates which the poor, benighted layman regards as telling him whether his industry is protected from ruinous foreign competition or whether it is not.

Here, in other words, in titles 3 and 4 of the tariff act, was the ground on which all good Democrats could come to the aid of their party. Here they could unite in a concerted effort to overthrow provisions, many of which are more vital than a dozen rate paragraphs. Here, by an adroit misinterpretation of the real purpose of an administrative section, they could condemn, denounce, and defeat, and in the process manage to damn the whole bill.

This was the plan, Mr. President, and for its fulfillment only one thing was necessary—a few more votes. The Democratic

leaders could count only 39 noses on their side of the aisle, and three or four of these were not to be counted on in carrying out the plan to wreck the proposed new law. Thirty-five would be a safer and more certain estimate, and 35 lacked 13 of being a majority in a Senate of 95 Members. But the remedy was in sight, in fact, it was right at hand. On this side of the Chamber there were 13 so-called Republican Members who seem to glory in the designation "insurgents." Here was a majority—48 out of a total of 95. It was close, but it probably would work. And thus, Mr. President, did the tariff coalition come into being—conceived in Democracy's desperation, but born in the nick of time. How well this plan worked is now rather generally known, but I propose to cause the principal tariff accomplishments of the coalition to pass in review, so that the country may know who has been writing this bill in the Senate, and who has been delaying its passage. I propose, in other words, Mr. President, to make this so-called "coalition" assume the responsibility which rightfully belongs to it, and which responsibility, as I shall show later, this coalition seems to have no desire to assume.

First, Mr. President, in order that there shall be no doubt in the public mind as to who are the Members on this side of the Chamber who joined with the Democratic minority to make the coalition and give it a working majority, I shall do them the distinction of including their names at this point. And here they are:

Senator BLAINE, Wisconsin; Senator BORAH, Idaho; Senator BROOKHART, Iowa; Senator CUTTING, New Mexico; Senator FRAZIER, North Dakota; Senator HOWELL, Nebraska; Senator LA FOLLETTE, Wisconsin; Senator McMASTER, South Dakota; Senator NORBECK, South Dakota; Senator NORRIS, Nebraska; Senator NYE, North Dakota; Senator PINE, Oklahoma; Senator SCHALL, Minnesota.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I am curious to know what the Senator was saying about "wild jackasses" over on his side of the aisle. I heard him mention their names, but I did not hear what he said about them.

Mr. GOFF. My mental evolution has never reached the "wild jackass" stage, I will say to the Senator in reply; and I will not yield further at this time.

Now, Mr. President, to return to the administrative provisions. I shall not take the time to go into all the details of the coalition's activity on the administrative sections, but when I have finished I believe I shall more than have demonstrated the manner in which the coalition by its accomplishments has to a very large measure destroyed the declared congressional intention of passing a tariff law which, according to its title, is supposed "to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, and to protect American labor."

Let us consider first, Mr. President, the attacks so successfully made on the so-called flexible tariff provision. Here was a provision which, in the President's opinion, was of supreme importance, for he dealt specifically with it in his special message in the following language:

Seven years of experience have proved the principle of flexible tariff to be practical, and in the long view a most important principle to maintain. However, the basis upon which the Tariff Commission makes its recommendations to the President for administrative changes in the rates of duty should be made more automatic and more comprehensive, to the end that the time required for determinations by the Tariff Commission shall be greatly shortened. The formula upon which the commission must now act often requires that years be consumed in reaching conclusions where it should require only months. Its very purpose is defeated by delays. I believe a formula can be found that will insure rapid and accurate determination of needed changes in rates. With such strengthening of the Tariff Commission and of its basis for action, many secondary changes in tariff can well be left to action by the commission, which at the same time will give complete security to industry for the future.

But what regard has the coalition for the well-considered opinion of the President? The answer is to be found in their action on the flexible tariff provision. They have destroyed the flexible tariff provision, for they have written into the bill that before a single rate can be changed on the basis of a Tariff Commission investigation showing the necessity for such a change the Congress must pass on its merits. What a travesty, Mr. President! What an absurdity! I am almost tempted to say what stupidity! For, as the New York Sun said editorially, "before the rate on a tenpenny nail can be changed," Congress must act. The coalition, in other words, has gone on record to the effect that the President is not to be trusted to make the minor emergency changes in the tariff which are shown to be necessary after an investigation by the Tariff Commission in which both sides have been given an opportunity to present their

cases. I am determined that the country shall know of this rebuke to the President of the United States, elected to his office only a little over a year ago by some 23,000,000 of our citizenry. Not only did President Hoover refer specifically to the need for the flexible provisions in his special message but he was so completely convinced of the necessity for retaining a provision giving the Executive power to change individual tariff rates in the light of changing economic conditions that, during the discussion and debate on this floor on these provisions, he issued a second plea in favor of leaving this emergency power with the Executive. But all in vain; the coalition by this time had the bit firmly in its teeth, and they destroyed the flexible tariff provisions.

I can understand to a certain extent why my Democratic colleagues would be a party to this plan. It was difficult at first to reconcile their attitude to Democracy's tariff stand during the last campaign, for it was only a little over a year ago that Democratic spokesmen were advocating to the people of the country a plan which would take the tariff out of politics and put it completely in the hands of the all-powerful Tariff Commission.

I wondered what happened to this brilliant conception when I listened to the attacks made against the flexible tariff by my Democratic colleagues, but I now see that the Democratic campaign proposal of a year ago was nothing but campaign buncombe, and that in the test we had last October when the flexible tariff was destroyed Democratic politics still outweighed Democratic economics. But, how can we possibly account for the participation of the 13 stalwart insurgent Republicans in the plan to destroy the flexible tariff? These 13 so-called Republican Members of the Senate come, without exception, from agricultural States, and in the seven years during which the flexible tariff provision has been in operation, agriculture has been the chief beneficiary of rate changes under the power vested in the Tariff Commission and the President by the act of 1922. Of the 36 rate changes made by the President since 1922 under the flexible tariff provision, and after investigation by the Tariff Commission, 32 have been increases and 4 have been decreases. Of these 32 increases, 11 are increases in agricultural rates; and here, Mr. President, is a summary of these agricultural increases, showing the date, the commodity affected, and the amount of the increase in the rate:

Wheat increased from 30 to 42 cents per bushel, 60 pounds, on April 6, 1924.

Flour increased from 78 cents to \$1.04 per 100 pounds on April 6, 1924.

Butter increased from 8 to 12 cents per pound on April 5, 1926.

Swiss cheese increased from 5 cents per pound, but not less than 25 per cent ad valorem, to 7½ cents per pound, but not less than 37½ per cent ad valorem, on July 8, 1927.

Cherries increased from 2 to 3 cents per pound on January 2, 1928.

Onions increased from 1 to 1½ cents per pound on January 21, 1929.

Peanuts increased from 3 to 4½ cents per pound on peanuts not shelled; from 4 to 6 cents per pound on peanuts, shelled, on February 18, 1929.

Eggs and egg products increased from 6 to 7½ cents per pound on March 22, 1929.

Flaxseed increased from 40 to 56 cents per bushel of 56 pounds on June 13, 1929.

Milk increased from 2½ to 3¾ cents per gallon on June 13, 1929.

Cream increased from 20 to 30 cents per gallon on June 13, 1929.

Here is a question beyond me to answer, Mr. President. Frankly I do not know why the 13 Republican Members of the coalition voted to destroy the flexible tariff in the light of its operation in favor of the farmer, unless the explanation is to be found in a program of vote trading between the Democrats and the insurgents in order to embarrass the President and his administration.

Let us consider next the handiwork of the coalition with respect to the valuation provision in the tariff law. For more than a century our ad valorem duties have been assessed on the basis of the foreign value of the imported article. This has meant that in at least ninety-nine cases out of a hundred our ad valorem duties have been assessed on the price at which the foreign producer invoices the merchandise to the American importer. Progressively over the last 25 or 30 years this system has been the basis of a growing abuse of undervaluation; and practically the only means open to our Government to-day to

ascertain the true foreign value of merchandise, whenever the customs authorities have reason to question the given value, is that of investigation by American Government agents. Such American agents are frankly regarded by foreign governments as commercial spies, and for the last 25 years their activity has been a constant source of friction in our international relations.

And yet, Mr. President, so long as our tariff law continues to assess its ad valorem duties on the basis of foreign valuation, the maintenance of this corps of investigators in foreign countries is absolutely necessary, if we are not going to say to foreign producers, "We shall determine the ad valorem rate which your imports shall pay, but we leave to you the fixing of the value on which these ad valorem rates are to be assessed."

Stated thus, some of my colleagues may object, but I say here and now that, so long as our ad valorem duties are assessed on the basis of foreign value, and unless we are prepared to continue our expensive and elaborate system of checking up on foreign values, we must accept the conclusion that we are turning over to foreign producers the power to determine the duty they will pay on their imports into this country, which are subject to ad valorem duties. In the few countries of the world which still adhere to foreign values as the basis of duty assessment, their system of tariff readjustment is so unlike our own that within a fortnight of the discovery of the inadequacy of a rate based on such value a truly protective rate may be provided. In other words, Mr. President, no great commercial nation in the world bases its ad valorem rates on such a weak, inadequate, and easily evaded foreign value system as we do.

The President sensed all this, and told us so in the following paragraph in his special message. I quote:

Furthermore, considerable weaknesses on the administrative side of the tariff have developed, especially in the valuation for assessments of duty. There are cases of undervaluations that are difficult to discover without access to the books of foreign manufacturers, which they are reluctant to offer. This has become also a great source of friction abroad. There is increasing shipment of goods on consignment, particularly by foreign shippers to concerns that they control in the United States, and this practice makes valuations difficult to determine. I believe it is desirable to furnish to the Treasury a sounder basis for valuation in these and other cases.

Nor was the President the only one to advocate the abandonment of foreign value as the primary basis for the assessment of ad valorem duties. I find upon examination of the hearings before both the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee that various representatives of American industry went on record in favor of getting rid of foreign value. I find that the representatives of American labor went on record against the continued use of foreign value, and I find, too, that the representatives of agriculture were outspoken in their denunciation of the continued use of foreign value for the assessment of our ad valorem duties. In short, Mr. President, the only witnesses before either the committee of the House or the committee of the Senate who spoke in favor of the continued use of foreign value were the importers, and, of course, in view of what I have said above, I need hardly enlarge upon the motives behind their representations to the committees.

Here, then, was an overwhelming request from the President of the United States, from American industry, from American agriculture, and from American labor for a change in the method of assessing our ad valorem duties. And what have we done? We have made a beautiful gesture. We have written into the proposed new tariff law section 340, which authorizes the Tariff Commission in the course of the next two years to make a conversion of the ad valorem rates as provided in the bill from the basis of foreign value to the basis of domestic value, and we direct the commission to report the results of its conversion analysis to Congress, and for what purpose?

Mr. President, is there anyone within the sound of my voice so glib as to think that within a month or two, or even within six months, after we get such report from the Tariff Commission, we shall pass a law changing our valuation basis from foreign value to domestic value and adjusting the rates accordingly? If there be any such person within the sound of my voice, he is much too innocent for this hard-boiled world!

Now, Mr. President, I would not do the coalition an injustice. They did not write section 340 as it now stands, but they approved it; and I make so bold as to hazard the statement that if they had not felt that section 340 was nothing but a beautiful gesture they would not have approved it. Oh, I know, that these are harsh words, but I have not sat here day after day for the

past six months without learning something of the viewpoint and attitude of the various members of the coalition. They approved it, Mr. President; they had the votes to defeat it; it could not have passed if they had not approved it; and, in approving it, they deliberately ignored an opportunity to enact a provision of law which would have represented the greatest advance in tariff legislation in this country in over a century. No rates were involved, no party principles or traditions needed to be compromised, it was simply the difference between providing for the effective administration of a law as against leaving it subject to the abuses which have grown up during the last 25 or 30 years, and against which all interested parties, except the importers, had suggested a change.

I refer next to section 501, relating to appraisement and reappraisement proceedings in the customs courts. This section, as reported to the Senate, included a provision giving to an American producer and to the representative of American labor the right to appear as parties in interest in reappraisement proceedings arising in the customs courts on the appeal of importers. In these cases, Mr. President, the importer is the plaintiff and the Government the defendant. The importer, objecting to the value placed on his merchandise by the Government appraising officer, takes the case into court in the hope of bringing about a lower appraisement, with a corresponding reduction in his duty. Now, I submit that an issue of this kind is not an issue between only the importer and the Government, but that the domestic producer or the American workman, whose products are in competition with the merchandise on which the importer is seeking a reappraisement, is vitally interested in the court's decision on this case.

It was said on the floor of this Chamber, when we were considering this provision, that a tariff bill is a revenue measure like our income-tax law, and that to permit an American producer or an American labor representative to appear in these cases brought by the importer against the Government would be like permitting a third party to intervene in a contest between a taxpayer and the Government.

The analogy is poor—very poor. A tariff bill is a revenue measure, but it is more than that. By the express language of its preamble it is "to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, and to protect American labor." Now, if it is the purpose of a tariff law to encourage American industries and protect American labor, how can it be said that permitting a domestic producer or labor representative to appear in these cases brought by an importer is analogous to permitting a third party to appear in an individual's tax case?

The tax law is exclusively a revenue measure and the tariff law is not. The analogy, therefore, fails, Mr. President; and I submit that if an American manufacturer or an American workman or an American farmer is likely to be affected by the decision in the case brought by the importer, American industry, labor, and agriculture should have a right to appear as a party in interest in these proceedings.

He who would attempt to deny this must also be prepared to deny the right of American labor and American producers to appear before the committees of Congress during a tariff revision in order to indicate the rates necessary for the maintenance of their business. Only the importers would have the right to be heard by the committees of Congress, because only they would have to pay the duties called for by the tariff law. Such a plan, I have no doubt, would receive the complete approval and hearty indorsement of certain of my colleagues; but I do not believe they are prepared to go quite that far—at least, not yet.

Now, what happened to this provision giving the representative of American labor, or an American producer, the right to appear in these cases brought by the importer against the Government? Why, Mr. President, the coalition struck it out, and thereby denied the right of American labor and American industry to cooperate with the Government against the importer's attempt to deprive the Government of customs revenue and the American workman and producer of the protection intended for them under the law. In striking out this proposed amendment the coalition deliberately ignored the appeal made before the tariff committees by the representatives of labor, that labor be granted this right to appear in these cases, and help prevent the importers in this country from destroying the American workman's chance to earn his livelihood.

Let us go on, Mr. President. Let us consider next section 515, which, as reported by the Finance Committee to the Senate, also contained a provision similar to that to which I have referred in section 501.

Section 515 relates to the classification of merchandise; and the provision incorporated in this section by the Finance Committee proposed to give to the representative of American labor and to the American producer the right to appear as parties in interest in cases arising in the customs courts on the protest of an importer against the classification of his merchandise.

It is on cases arising under this section of the law, Mr. President, that little toy music boxes for the amusement of children 6 or 8 years old have been held not to be toys, dutiable at 70 per cent, but musical instruments, dutiable at 40 per cent. It is under this section of the law that woolen blankets for use in the manufacture of paper have been held not to be manufactures of wool, dutiable at 45 cents a pound and 50 per cent ad valorem, but as parts of machines, dutiable at 30 per cent. It is under this section of the law that many rates upon which labor and industry relied have been materially reduced, and with no opportunity for labor or industry to intervene.

In short, Mr. President, this section of the law has been a veritable wide-open barn door, through which the importers of the country have been able to bring in untold quantities of merchandise at lower duties than the act intended, or with the payment of no duty at all. So long as it remains unchanged, it constitutes the greatest menace to the maintenance of our protective policy.

I indicated in beginning my discussion on section 515 that the Finance Committee proposed an amendment which would have permitted American labor and American producers to cooperate with the Government in the attempt to prevent these wholly unnecessary and in many cases absolutely absurd decisions. I maintain, Mr. President, that American labor and American producers are entitled to appear as parties in interest in these cases for the same reasons that I indicated they have a right to appear in appraisement cases under section 501. Again I repeat, it is no argument to say that the contest is one between the importer and the Government on the ground that the amount of the duty which the importer must pay involves entirely the question of an individual's property right. I insist, Mr. President, that the American workingman and the American producer may have a far greater property right at stake in these cases than has the importer.

If the decision in one of these cases results in the reduction of the duty below what Congress has established as the safe protective duty, or if the decision results in the transfer of the commodity from the dutiable to the free list, as far too many of these decisions have, then, Mr. President, the entire business of the American producer, his whole investment, and the whole livelihood of the American workman, may be involved.

My colleagues talk about the importer only being concerned because he only must pay. Why, Mr. President, the American producer may pay for one of these decisions with his whole business, and the American workman may pay for one of these decisions with his sole means of earning a livelihood. And yet they stand here and say that the issue is one which concerns only the importer and the Government! Such a contention is nothing short of outrageous. It amounts to a violation of the purpose for which we are sent here by the people of this country, and it comes dangerously near to being a violation of our oath of office.

I have indicated what happened, Mr. President. The coalition took one look at the Finance Committee's proposed amendment to give an American producer, or the representative of American labor, the right to appear in these classification cases brought by an importer against the Government. And what did the coalition do with this proposed amendment? Why, they struck it out! Again, it made no difference to the coalition that the representatives of American labor had appealed to Congress to grant them this right to appear in these cases and help safeguard their right to earn their livelihood in their own country.

Here, then, are the four outstanding accomplishments of the coalition's manhandling of the administrative provisions: They have destroyed the flexible tariff provision; they have done nothing toward the abandonment of foreign value, with all its evils and abuses; they have denied the right of American producers and American labor to help prevent the importers from securing their own value on imports into this country; and they have similarly denied the right of American producers and American labor to help prevent the importers from securing their own classification on foreign merchandise which competes in our own country with the products of our producers and our labor.

If this were all, it should be enough to convince the American people that their trust has been violated; but it is not all, Mr. President. The coalition has fastened on this tariff bill that

legislative monstrosity, the export debenture plan—the plan which has been opposed in no uncertain terms by President Hoover; the plan which the representatives of the people in the House have twice rejected; the plan, Mr. President, which has met with almost universal condemnation by the majority of our people; and the plan which provides in effect that the Government shall subsidize one of the industries of this country, thereby establishing a precedent for every other American industry to appeal for such a subsidy. The sorry lesson learned by Great Britain in its attempt to fix the price and control the production of rubber meant nothing to the coalition; nor, apparently, has the coalition ever heard of the hopeless failure which finished Brazil's coffee valorization plan.

The coalition has written into the sections of the law relating to the Tariff Commission a provision establishing a "consumer's counsel." And what for? I will tell you what for, Mr. President: To add a partisan, low-tariff slant to the commission's activities by including in its personnel a representative whose whole purpose must inevitably be to destroy the scientific, impartial attitude which it is expected the commission shall maintain. So much for the consumer's counsel—another coalition gold brick to the people of this country.

Here, Mr. President, are the principal counts in my indictment against the coalition's handling of the administrative sections. I could go on still further. I could tell that section 304, relating to the marking of imported articles, is not satisfactory. I could tell that section 487, relating to the importer's right to amend the value of his entry, as it now stands, will lead to gross abuses. I could point out that section 510 of the tariff act of 1922, giving the Government the right to inspect the books of exporters to this country, has disappeared from the proposed new law which the coalition is writing, and I want them to tell us why. Why has section 510 been eliminated, and why should our Government virtually relinquish its control over our customs and hand it over to the shippers in foreign countries? Let them answer these questions. Let them try to do it to the satisfaction of the American people. And I could tell, Mr. President, that section 516, which would give to American labor and to American producers the right to appeal or protest against the value or the classification of imported merchandise, has been so emasculated that it is no remedy at all. Let them explain to the producers of the country why this has been done.

Here is quite a program of explanation for the coalition, which surely they will not shirk; and when they have attempted this explanation they will only have begun, for I propose now to charge them with the ruthless, and, at times, blind and unreasoning, slaughter of the rate schedules. Let them listen to this also, and consider well what explanation they will make.

The Senate began its consideration of the rate schedule on October 21, 1929, four months ago; and with only an occasional interruption for a brief period we have been at these schedules ever since. Now, Mr. President, for the benefit of certain of my colleagues who, I have no doubt, would like to see me conclude this arraignment, I can say this much for their aid and comfort: I do not propose, in my consideration of what the coalition have done to the rate schedules, to cover every paragraph and every item they have attacked. Instead, by referring to a number of the more important accomplishments of the coalition in the rate schedules, I shall indicate to the American people the kind of a tariff bill they are going to get if the coalition has its way.

By November 9 we had reached Schedule 3, the metal schedule; and by this time it was undeniably evident that the coalition forces intended to rewrite the rate schedules even more completely than they had rewritten the administrative provisions. Apparently convinced that the whole procedure was so unnecessary, so almost useless, and the cause of so much avoidable delay, on Saturday, November 9, the chairman of the Finance Committee, the Senator from Utah, responsible for the legislative procedure of the bill, endeavored to find a remedy. On that date, Mr. President, the Senator from Utah made what seemed to me an eminently fair proposal; and I shall indicate it here by reading it from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as he made it. I read from page 5379 of the RECORD:

Mr. President, I just want to make a statement. I had some hope of securing the passage of this bill before the opening of the regular session of the Congress in December. Evidently, if the past actions of the Senate in regard to the bill are to be taken into consideration, it is perfectly useless to think of that result.

I would like to see some action taken, and, as one, I am perfectly willing that the Senate shall take a recess to-day until the 20th of the month, and in the meantime let the coalition examine the amendments

proposed and report to the Senate whatever amendments they agree upon, and after the bill is taken up let a vote be taken upon the amendments without a word of discussion, and let us pass the bill.

This was an eminently fair proposal, as I shall shortly show by the statements of the coalition's own spokesmen; but first let me say that no sooner had the Senator from Utah made this proposal than that it was promptly rejected by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] for the Democrats, and by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] for the insurgent Republicans. To show that it was an eminently fair proposal, Mr. President, let us consider one of the statements of the Senator from Idaho in rejecting it. I read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for November 9, 1929, page 5379, Mr. BORAH speaking:

I am satisfied that the discussion in the Chamber, with the possible exception of that relating perhaps to three or four items, will not change any votes. We have been considering the bill for weeks and months, when we take into consideration the long summer of discussion. Senators have made up their minds. They are well informed as to what they wish to do. As to particular items, outside of perhaps a half a dozen, I think it is safe to say that Senators now are pretty well concluded as to how they wish to dispose of the bill. That is what we ought to do.

That the Senator from North Carolina subscribed to this expression by the Senator from Idaho, witness the following paragraph from his remarks, on page 5380 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for November 9. Mr. SIMMONS said:

I think the Senator from Idaho is entirely right when he says that most of the matters have been thoroughly thought out. The Senate has become interested in tariff revision as it has never been interested in any tariff revision heretofore made. All of us have been studying the amendments to the House provisions which have or have not been amended by the Senate Finance Committee, and I think we have all about made up our minds as to how we want to vote. I believe there will be from now on, as the Senator from Idaho has indicated, but very little discussion with respect to the amendments. I think from now on we will make very rapid progress and that it is highly probable that we will be able to dispose of the amendments and act upon the bill before the termination of the extraordinary session of Congress, which will, of course, automatically end at the beginning of the next regular session. I hope we will be able to do so at least; but we want to do it not by suppressing an expression of views and opinions. We want to do it in a way which will give full opportunity of discussion.

Mr. President, if this were so, why, then, was the offer of the Senator from Utah rejected? If the coalition forces had in mind and well in hand the amendments they proposed, and if these could all be settled, with the possible exception of a half dozen, with little or no debate, discussion, and delay, then why did not the coalition take over the proposed new tariff bill and put it through the Senate, as the Senator from North Carolina thought could be done "before the termination of the extraordinary session of Congress"? Certainly a proposition so simple as this must have a rather simple answer, and in view of its apparent simplicity I am induced to undertake the answer; and here it is:

By their own acknowledgment, Mr. President, the coalition's proposed amendments were all in contemplation; and if this were true—and they said it was—then by getting together, agreeing on them, and putting them through, as the Senator from Utah proposed, with little or no discussion, is it not obvious that the progress of the bill through the Senate would have been very greatly expedited? But such expedition was apparently no part of the coalition's plan; and so the offer of the Senator from Utah was rejected, in order—and the conclusion seems to me inescapable—that the coalition forces could hold up and delay the passage of this bill, to the great disgust of the American people, and to the great increase of the already existing uncertainty in business. By the middle of October last, Mr. President, while we were still considering the administrative provisions, it was calculated that the coalition forces in the Senate had consumed 129 hours in debate and discussion as against 28 hours consumed by what is called the administration forces. And since this was to be continued, and it has been, what other reason can there be for the coalition's rejection of the offer of the Senator from Utah to take over the bill, write it, and speed it up?

But I think there is another answer, Mr. President; and it is all contained in the single word "responsibility." Accepting the offer of the Senator from Utah meant the acceptance of responsibility by the coalition before the American people for the provisions of this bill; and that is apparently the last thing the coalition wanted.

Now, Mr. President, however much opposed to a man's actions I may be, I can still find it in myself to admire him for his opposition and attacks if he will assume the responsibility for them, and not try to cover up himself or hide behind another, and in that hiding attempt to place the responsibility for his actions upon the shoulders of the one behind whom he hides. That, to me, borders upon the despicable; and he who does it deserves the punishment and the retribution which inevitably seeks him out. Now, Mr. President, I would not do the Senator from Idaho an injustice; for apparently caught unawares by the suddenness and the fairness of the offer by the Senator from Utah, and staggered momentarily perhaps by its significance, he did let the cat out of the bag. In the opening paragraph of his rejection of the offer by the Senator from Utah he plainly shows that he saw behind the offer the dreaded spectre of responsibility. Here is what he said. I read:

Mr. President, I simply want to say that it does not seem to me that the suggestion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] is practical. Even if we had a substitute bill here I do not think that we would be able to make progress upon it more rapidly or speedily than we are making upon the bill now before us. But I do want to say, as I intimated a few days ago, that those whom some are disposed to term "the coalition" are really now in charge of the making of the bill. The responsibility is upon us. What the country wants, in my judgment, is speed. They have pretty well made up their minds as to the bill, generally speaking. In my judgment, it is incumbent upon us to dispose of the bill as rapidly as we can, taking into consideration, of course, that there are some items which necessarily must be discussed. If we do not do so we will be held responsible from this time on for the delay. We can not escape that responsibility.

There it is, Mr. President. The Senator from Idaho says the country wants speed. He says the coalition is really now in charge of the making of the bill. He says that the responsibility is upon them; and early in November of 1929 the Senator from Idaho said that if the bill was not speeded up the coalition would be held responsible from that time on for the delay, and he said that they could not escape that responsibility. I do not propose that they shall; but more on that later.

Thus it happened that the open offer of the Senator from Utah, openly made, was openly rejected by the coalition; and thus it happens, too, Mr. President, that we are still debating the rate schedules in this proposed new bill on the floor of the United States Senate. Let us now return to the details of certain of the more important results of the coalition's activities on these schedules.

I should like to begin, Mr. President, by restating a self-evident truth, or rather a truth which I thought was self-evident. Every pound, every yard, every bushel, every ton, every dollar's worth of competitive imported merchandise which comes into this country displaces at least an equivalent amount of the products made in American mills by American workers, or grown on the American farms by American farmers. A few years ago the chairman of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation, Mr. Charles M. Schwab, who I think we will all agree knows something about the details of making iron and steel, estimated that it required the work of 5,000 men for one day to make 1,000 tons of steel rails. He went on to say—I quote:

Let us suppose that to-day an American railroad placed an order for 50,000 tons of rails in Belgium, Germany, or England because these rails might be bought for less money abroad than at home. This would mean that 5,000 men in our own country would be idle for 50 days. It would mean that several thousand employees of our railroads would be deprived of hauling these rails and the raw materials, such as coal, coke, iron, and so forth, which come from the mines to the mills. It would mean that thousands of miners would have less work if the product of their labor were not used by the mills. It would mean that the workers of the mines, mills, and railroads would have less money to spend for the necessities of life with the baker, the grocer, or the retailer.

Mr. President, what the chairman of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation says about imported steel rails displacing American steel rails, the product of American mills and American workers, applies to a greater or a lesser degree to all competitive merchandise coming into this country, be it steel rails, pig iron, glass, chemicals, watches, boots and shoes, soybeans, wheat, casein, or toys for the nursery. That, Mr. President, is the self-evident truth with which I wish to begin. Now let us see to what extent the coalition forces have been guided by that self-evident truth.

In the seven years from 1923 to 1929 there have been imported into this country 421,802,000 pounds of window glass, valued at

\$16,970,000 on the basis of foreign value. These imports reached the enormous total in 1927 of 82,747,000 pounds, and amounted last year to 66,819,000 pounds. The menace of this foreign competition became so great that three or four years ago the domestic industry appealed to the Tariff Commission for relief under section 315, which gives to the President the power to increase or decrease duties in the attempt to equalize the differences in the cost of production of the domestic commodity as compared with the foreign-made article. On the basis of the Tariff Commission's investigation, conducted in both the United States and foreign countries, the President last June increased the rates on imported window glass. The House was so thoroughly convinced of the need for this increased duty on window glass, in order to protect our domestic producers and our American workers, that it accepted and wrote into the new law virtually the same rates promulgated by the President on the basis of the Tariff Commission's report.

What did the coalition do, Mr. President? Why, it did just what it did in the case of pig iron. It swept aside all of the evidence resulting from the Tariff Commission's investigation, and it restored the ruinous rates provided in the Fordney-McCumber Act.

What kind of a procedure is this, Mr. President? Here was a case in which the coalition was not asked for an increased duty on the basis of facts offered by the domestic producers. Here was a case in which an elaborate and scientific and exhaustive investigation by the Tariff Commission showed as clear a case for an increase in the duty as has ever been shown. And what, may I ask, has become of Democracy's faith of a year ago in tariff revision on the basis of Tariff Commission investigations? Why, Mr. President, that was a sham, a mere vote-catching device; and by its action in slashing the proposed rate on window glass the real Democratic principle of a competitive tariff stands forth in all its destructive power.

If these window-glass rates are restored to their former ruinous levels, some one, Mr. President, will have to assume the responsibility before the people of this country for increasing depression in the American window-glass industry and for increasing unemployment for the workers in that industry. Here and now, Mr. President, I charge the coalition forces with that responsibility.

Let us take next watches and watch movements. The imports of these in the seven years from 1923 through 1929 have amounted to 23,828,000 pieces, valued at \$61,503,000. These imports have increased from 2,156,000 watches and movements in 1923 to 5,146,000 in 1929; and in explanation of this the Tariff Commission, in its Survey of Tariff Information prepared for the particular use of Congress in this present revision, says—I quote:

The principal factor in the competitive situation between the United States and Switzerland is labor cost, which is reported to form about 90 per cent of the total cost of manufacturing in the United States.

The House rewrote this paragraph to provide necessary increases in the duty in order to check these rapidly increasing imports of foreign-made watches and movements, with their destroying effect on the American industry. The Finance Committee proposed a further revision of this paragraph in the attempt to make it protective. What did the coalition do, Mr. President? Why, it destroyed these proposed amendments to the watch paragraph and restored it virtually to the paragraph in the 1922 law. Between 1925 and 1927 the number of wage earners in the American watch industry decreased from 17,395 to 15,552, due almost entirely, in my opinion, to the rising tide of imported foreign-made watches, which I have indicated in the statistics quoted above.

Mr. President, is this slow death for the American watch industry to continue, and are its wage earners to be thrown out of employment at the rate of almost a thousand a year? The coalition says it is. If these watches and watch movements rates are restored to their former ruinous levels, some one will have to assume the responsibility before the people of this country for increasing depression in the American watch industry and for increasing unemployment for the workers in that industry. Here and now I charge the coalition forces with that responsibility.

Take next the case of tapestries and other Jacquard-woven upholstery cloths covered in paragraph 909. For the seven years, 1923 through 1929, the importations of these cotton fabrics have reached the enormous total of \$25,939,000 on the basis of foreign value. In 1923 the imports of these cotton fabrics were valued at \$1,196,000 on the basis of foreign value. By 1927 they had increased to a value of \$5,468,000 foreign value; and

for the last year, 1929, they amounted to \$4,650,000 on the basis of foreign value. Now it is a commonly accepted fact in practically all lines that, in order to arrive at the displacement value of imports into this country, which are given on the basis of foreign values, it is necessary at least to double the foreign-value figures, and often they need to be trebled. But suppose we double them. In the year 1927, the last year for which we have Government statistics available, the total value of the American production of cotton tapestries amounted to \$16,612,000, a decrease of over \$4,000,000 from the 1923 production of \$20,899,297. Now, I have indicated that the 1927 imports were valued at almost \$5,500,000 foreign value, and doubling this would make their displacement value for purposes of comparing them with the value of domestic production about \$11,000,000. In other words, Mr. President, the displacement of imports of these cotton woven fabrics in 1927 amounted to \$11,000,000, as compared with a domestic production of \$16,612,000.

I shall leave to my colleagues from the cotton-growing States the calculation of this percentage relationship between imports of these cotton fabrics and their domestic production, with all that this means to the consumption of American-grown cotton by American cotton tapestry mills.

Both the House and the Senate Finance Committee, Mr. President, proposed to increase the rates on these products in order to check these increasing imports. What did the coalition do, Mr. President? Why, it threw these proposed increased duties overboard, and restored the ruinous rates in the 1922 law. If these cotton-tapestry rates are restored to their former ruinous level, some one, Mr. President, will have to assume the responsibility before the people of this country for increasing depression in the American cotton-tapestry industry and for increasing unemployment for the workers in that industry. Here and now I charge the coalition forces with that responsibility.

Let us next take the case of structural shapes of steel, covered in paragraph 312. For the seven years 1923 to 1929, imports of these steel shapes amounted to 1,627,000,000 pounds, valued at \$25,832,000. Imports of such structural shapes in 1923, Mr. President, amounted to 23,909,000 pounds, valued at \$682,000. By 1928 these imports had risen to 366,826,000 pounds, valued at \$5,271,000. Roughly, these imports expressed in pounds amounted to over 150,000 long tons; and considering the physical character of steel shapes as compared with steel rails, I would assume that it would take about as many men about the same length of time to make a thousand tons of steel shapes as it takes to make a thousand tons of steel rails. Therefore, according to Mr. Schwab's figures, it took 5,000 men working a day to make 1,000 tons of steel rails; and on the basis I assume it would take 750,000 men working for a day to produce 150,000 tons of structural-steel shapes. Stated in that way, the loss to our steel mills and our steel workers by virtue of the imports of structural-steel shapes into this country for the single year 1929 staggers the imagination; and so I shall state it differently. Assuming 30 days to a month, these imports of structural-steel shapes for the single year 1929 displaced the product of 25,000 men working for one month.

Despite this showing, the House made no change in the rate on structural steel shapes; but the Finance Committee proposed an increase on these products covered in paragraph 312. What did the coalition do? Why, it knocked out the Finance Committee's proposed increase and restored the rate to the 1922 level, which has permitted the fourteenfold increase in the imports of these steel products between 1923 and 1929. If these structural-steel-shape rates are restored to their former ruinous levels, some one, Mr. President, will have to assume the responsibility before the people of this Nation for increasing depression in the American structural-steel-shape industry, and for increasing unemployment for the workers in that industry. Here and now I charge the coalition forces with that responsibility.

Let us take next the case of earthen tableware, covered in paragraph 211. From 1923 through 1929 the imports of earthenware into this country have amounted to \$49,842,000 on the basis of foreign value. In 1923, Mr. President, these imports on the basis of foreign value amounted to \$6,546,000, while for the last year, 1929, they had increased to \$8,129,000. Now, the craft of the potter is one of those industries in which the labor element makes by far the largest item of cost, and unless this industry is given adequate protective rates the imports into this country are going to continue to grow, and many of those engaged in the pottery business in this country might just as well reconcile themselves to a closing of their plants, and the workers in these plants had best begin giving serious thought to the learning of some other trade not quite so completely at the

mercy of the coalition forces. The House of Representatives recognized the need for additional protection for the pottery industry and increased the rates in paragraph 211 over those in the 1922 act. The necessity for an increase in these rates was also recognized by the Senate Finance Committee, and as the bill was reported to the Senate it was proposed that imported earthenware pay an increased duty. No such proposal was to get beyond the coalition, however, and they struck it out, restoring the rates in this paragraph to the 1922 level.

If these earthenware rates are restored to their former ruinous levels, some one will have to assume the responsibility before the people of this country for increasing depression in the American earthenware industry and for increasing unemployment for the workers in that industry. Here and now, once again, I charge the coalition forces with that responsibility.

Finally, Mr. President, as our concluding tribute to the handiwork of the coalition in the rate schedules, let us consider the case of leather boots and shoes, covered in paragraph 1607. In the seven years from 1923 to 1929 the imports of leather shoes into this country have amounted to 13,148,000 pairs, valued at \$39,531,000 on the basis of foreign value. A still more striking statistical showing in the imports of shoes into this country is brought out by a comparison of the 1923 totals with the latest available figures, those for 1929. In 1923 the imports of shoes into this country amounted to 399,000 pairs, valued at \$1,246,000. Seven years later, in 1929, the imports had risen over fifteenfold to 6,183,000 pairs, valued at \$17,026,000. What has happened to the American shoe industry while this was going on? The answer is to be found briefly in the decrease in the number of workers in American shoe factories.

The Government statistics report that in 1925 there were 207,000 workers engaged in our boot and shoe industry. Two years later, in 1927, this figure had shrunk by almost 4,000 to 203,110. I might observe in passing that in 1927 the imports of foreign-made shoes into this country amounted to less than one and one-half million pairs, whereas in 1929 they amounted to over 6,000,000 pairs. Such a showing, Mr. President, forecasts the results which the 1929 statistics will indicate as soon as they are available, and I commend their close study to the coalition forces; and I hope, too, they will be able to explain to their people that decreasing employment for the wage earners in the American boot and shoe industry is a fine thing for the American farmer.

What the coalition forces did to the House proposal retained by the Senate Finance Committee to impose a duty on these foreign-made shoes coming into this country in increasing volume is now generally known. The coalition put shoes back on the free list; and the producers of shoes and the workers in their plants in Czechoslovakia will undoubtedly be everlastingly grateful to the Senate coalition for this indication of their tribute and affection. But what, Mr. President, will the workers in the shoe industries in Massachusetts, New York, and Missouri have to say to this move on the part of the coalition?

If these boot and shoe rates are restored to their former ruinous levels, some one, Mr. President, will have to assume the responsibility before the people of the country for increasing depression in the American leather boot and shoe industry and for increasing unemployment for the workers in that industry. Here and now, Mr. President, I charge the coalition with that responsibility.

Mr. President, here is quite a record of destruction on the part of the coalition; and it only tells a part of the story. I think it tells enough, however, to indicate to the American people what kind of a tariff bill is on its way to them if the coalition can hang together long enough.

That the coalition's handling of the rate schedules has been ruthless and at times, Mr. President, even blind and unreasoning, I shall let the following paragraph from one of the tariff accounts in the New York Times bear evidence. I quote:

• • • The coalition "steam roller" moved so fast that after one vote the combination found it had made a mistake. It voted down a committee amendment on granular iron on the theory that the \$2-a-ton duty was an increase. A few moments later it was ascertained that the committee had actually decreased the rate from \$6.75 a ton. Senator GEORGE sought to have the item reopened, but consent was declined. As a result the item now goes into a "basket" clause, where it may be readjusted when the Senate reaches it.

That statement by the New York Times was made last November while the Senate was acting on the amendments proposed by the Finance Committee. That was only the beginning, Mr. President. On the 4th day of February the slaughter of the Finance Committee's proposed amendments by the coalition

was concluded, and the layman might have thought the worst was over. For almost three months the coalition had hammered at every important increase in the industrial rates over the 1922 levels, regardless in many cases of the evidence indicating the necessity for this increase, regardless of the recommendation in President Hoover's message that there were industries unable successfully to stand up against increasing foreign competition unless given an increased rate, and regardless, too, of the Republican campaign pledge on the tariff of a year and a half ago.

But the worst was not over, Mr. President. The slaughter was to continue, and no longer was it to be confined to proposed increases in the rates over the 1922 levels.

On February 5 we began the consideration of individual amendments from the floor to the proposed new tariff law. Now, Mr. President, I knew that there was going to be a considerable number of these individual amendments. Shortly before we began their consideration I learned that over 200 individual amendments to the bill had been offered and were available in printed form. But this mere handful of over 200 was only the beginning, for we now know that there were hundreds of others in contemplation which were not printed and about which many of us were to know nothing until we heard them sent to the desk, read, and immediate action proposed.

I am not for a moment denying the right of any Member of this Senate to follow such a procedure if he sees fit. He can hold an amendment in his office or in his desk for three months or six months if he so desires, saying nothing about it until he is ready to spring it. Nor am I saying that such a procedure reminds me somewhat of what you might expect in a star-chamber proceeding. I am simply saying that such a practice of holding back amendments until just before immediate action is proposed on them is hardly in accordance with the usual procedure of government in a democracy, a fundamental requirement of which is that nothing shall be "put over" until those interested shall be given an opportunity to be heard on the merits of the proposition.

I sat here and heard the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS] object to these tactics of railroading individual amendments to this bill through without notice; and I sat here and heard the senior Senator from Michigan answered and argued down in a most illogical fashion by various members of the coalition forces for daring to raise his voice in opposition to the railroading and steam-roller procedure which the coalition felt itself strong enough to adopt. So, Mr. President, while admitting that an individual Senator may rise in his place, propose an amendment to this tariff law of which no previous indication has been given, and ask for its immediate consideration, I claim that such a procedure, when it becomes the common practice, is at least tainted with the suspicion that those sponsoring the plan for one reason or another are afraid to give notice of their contemplated amendments.

I realize, Mr. President, that this will be regarded as a strong statement; but let those who object to it tell me, let them tell the Members of the Senate, and let them tell the American people why they have refused to give notice of the amendments they contemplated, and why they have held them back. They were probably all in contemplation last November, when the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], perhaps unwittingly but none the less impressively and expressly, indicated that the coalition forces knew, and knew well, what amendments they proposed to offer to this bill. I insist that they should have made these amendments available so that those likely to be affected by the contemplated changes would at least have had the opportunity of expressing their viewpoint before the amendments were railroaded through this body. I assert that the rights of those likely to be affected by these amendments demanded that advance notice of them be given. I claim that the fundamental principles of a democratic government demanded that such notice be given. I claim that fair play demanded this notice. And, finally, Mr. President, in view of the fact that many of these "secret" amendments called for changes in existing rates, I claim that the burden of justifying these changes, the burden of proving that the proposed decrease in the rate should be made was on him who proposed the amendment.

Perhaps in this last, Mr. President, we have the real reason for the coalition's method of handling the secret amendments. Perhaps they knew they could not prove the necessity for the decrease in the existing duty which they were proposing. Certainly the attempt at proof which has been offered when the amendments were submitted has been a sorry evidentiary attempt, to say the least. After proposing one of the secret amendments, the Senator sponsoring it sticks his nose in a book,

reads a few figures concerning domestic production and imports, relates the one to the other, and demands a decrease in the duty thereupon.

Why, Mr. President, the very fact that the imports in many of these cases have been small as compared with the domestic production may be the direct result of the fact that the 1922 rate in question is protective; that it is shutting out of this country an unlimited importation of cheap foreign merchandise. The fact that any imports are coming in at all, and the evidence usually has been that there is some importation, indicates that the rate is not prohibitive. If the rates in the 1922 act were not supposed to be protective, then, in Heaven's name, what were they supposed to be? If they were not to check the unlimited flow of importations into this country, then, pray, what were they supposed to do?

I ask the coalition forces these questions, Mr. President; and I say to them that before they can justify the cuts and the slashes in the 1922 rates which they have been putting through here in the last several weeks by their process of secret amendments, they will have to tell me and the people of this country whether or not they stand for protective rates or for what I think are called competitive rates. I submit that on the basis of these secret amendments, and the procedure the coalition has adopted in railroading through this body these cuts in the 1922 rates, these coalition forces are finally out in the open against the protective policy and in favor of competitive rates.

Our President had something to say on this kind of a tariff in the speech he made in Newark, N. J., from which I quoted above; and I shall take the opportunity here of reading again what the President said on this score. I read from his Newark speech:

The protective tariff has been the fundamental policy of the Republican Party ever since the party was founded. Against it the Democratic Party has battled for these same 70 years. Two months ago their platform hinted that they thought we might be right. However, they declared for a tariff that would maintain effective competition. That must mean a tariff which will maintain effective competition of foreign against American goods. That is not protection.

Now, as far as I have been able to observe, these attempts on the part of the coalition to substitute competitive tariff rates for protective tariff rates have been directed particularly at certain large American industries, which have had the very great misfortune during the past six or eight years to be rather successful. Besides the reference to a few statistics showing imports as compared with domestic production, about the only other supporting data which the various members of the coalition have offered in support of their manhandling of the industrial rates have been an occasional reference to the profits made by a particular American industry, which, as I mentioned above, has had the misfortune of making some profits during the past few years.

The absurd and illogical way in which these data have been used in this Chamber has not infrequently appeared to be an insult to the intelligence of all fair-minded men. No attempt has been made to compare the profits of an individual company with either the amount of sales from which those profits have been derived or the capitalization of the particular company made the subject of the attack. No attempt has been made to analyze those profits and to apportion them to the different lines of the company's activities, some of which might not be affected at all by the tariff. In other words, it is perfectly possible for one of these large American companies which has been attacked by the coalition forces to have made its profits, or the larger portion of them, from their activities which have not had to face ruinous foreign competition, and meanwhile to have made very small profits or actually to have sustained a loss on those of its activities which have felt the brunt of foreign competition in the American markets.

The coalition had no interest in any of this, Mr. President. It was sufficient for their purposes only to know that one of these American companies had been successful and to hold up as a monstrous example of everything that was bad the profits made by this company, and which profits, almost without exception, go to the thousands of stockholders of that company, most of whom will be found to be American citizens.

As I have listened to these outrageous tactics on the floor of this Senate it has seemed to me that only one conclusion was possible; namely, that to the Senate coalition it was some sort of a heinous crime for an American industry to be successful. I say here and now that if I were such a successful American industry I would be without contrition, the coalition in the United States Senate to the contrary notwithstanding. I would be without contrition, Mr. President, for I

would know that my success was something to be proud of, not only to the thousands of American citizens who are the real owners of my company but I would be without contrition, for I would know that the success of my industry had been a great boon to American labor, who had shared in full measure in the success of my industry by virtue of the employment they have had, and which made my success possible.

Every attack made by the coalition on the prosperity of these large American enterprises has been indirectly, but none the less surely, an attack upon American labor; for, obviously, no one will deny that as American industry is prosperous American labor is employed.

I say to American labor, therefore, let them note, and note well, this attack made by the coalition on the prosperity of certain large American enterprises, and let American labor consider, and consider well, what these attacks by the coalition on these industries will mean to the continued prosperity of these industries and to the continued employment of the labor employed by them.

Mr. President, while we are on the subject of these attacks by the coalition on certain of America's great industrial enterprises, I would consider one other probable result of these coalition attacks. In this I address myself particularly to a certain well-advertised and fundamental proposition in the faith of the Democratic Party. This proposition of which I speak is Democracy's long-standing and well-advertised glorification of the doctrine of competition. Democracy has shouted from the housetops for so long that the memory of man runneth not to the contrary that competition is to be exalted and monopoly stifled, that I say it has become one of the fundamental tenets of Democratic economy. Now, Mr. President, it has long been Democracy's boast, and I am convinced that the whole proposition is a fallacy, that by tearing down the tariff they would lower the prices of the commodities affected in this country. Suppose we assume for the moment that this fallacy is tenable. Suppose we assume that reducing the tariff will reduce the price. This result can be brought about only by letting into this country increased importations of low-cost foreign merchandise which, let us say, results in a decrease in the price. If this happens, who feels it first? Why, the answer is obvious. The small, independent American producer will be the first to feel the result of these increased low-cost importations into this country; for it is an economic truism that compared with the large-scale industrial enterprises the small independent producer's costs are always higher. So, Mr. President, the inevitable result, if these low-cost importations beat down the American price—and Democracy says they will—will be a struggle in the markets of this country between the large-scale American producer and the importers of the cheap foreign merchandise. In this struggle the small American producer must inevitably occupy the position of the victim caught between the upper and the nether millstones, and it will only be a matter of time before he passes from the picture.

So, Mr. President, if Democracy's prophecy that a lower tariff means lower prices comes to pass, then I say that my Democratic colleagues are parties to a plan which must inevitably lead to the extinction of the small independent American producer, with his competitive influence on the markets and prices of this country which influence we have been led to believe is so dear to Democracy's heart. Now, I would modify this conclusion in only one respect, Mr. President. It is simply this: Such a plan, I will admit in Democracy's favor, would probably not result in a decrease in competition in the American markets. They would still retain this competition; but they would substitute for the competition of the small American producer, which they have eliminated, the competition of low-cost foreign producers. How are my Democratic colleagues going to explain this result of their handiwork to the tens of thousands of small American producers and to the hundreds of thousands of American workmen employed by these producers, and in whose interests Democracy has always professed such an interest.

This all leads to one other thought which to me presents the most inexplicable and insoluble problem connected with the coalition's program. For six months these coalition forces, these Democrats and these insurgent Republicans, have been doing everything within their power to attack the high economic standards we have built up in this country over the past century and a half; and by their every action they seek to pull down these standards and to bring about an end of the prosperity of this great Nation. Why they would do this, or why they would even attempt to do it, let the coalition explain to a waiting and expectant public.

I can not believe they really mean to accomplish such a work of destruction. I speak, I must in all sadness admit, with only a very inadequate idea of the mental attitude, or the mental processes, or the mental viewpoint of a Democrat or an insurgent Republican. But so far as I do know, and in all sincerity, these two species of the genus homo seem to be and are about as civilized as the rest of us, and as fond of the good things of life which make up the American standard of living; and I can not believe that they would willfully and wantonly bring about the economic ruin of their firesides. I have never heard of a Democrat or an insurgent Republican either, for that matter, who thought that it would be a good thing for the American people to return to the status of a simple pastoral or agricultural civilization—the status in which the community has but few wants, and these all satisfied within itself, a status with no automobiles, no radios, no electric lights, no newspapers, no school system; a status, in short, Mr. President, with none of the good things of life to which we are accustomed; a status, if you please, with no silk stockings for ladies. I can not believe that my Democratic colleagues and the insurgent Republicans would bring these things about; and yet for the past six months they have on the floor of this Senate endeavored to put through a legislative enactment which strikes at the very basis of our standards of living and at the very basis of our prosperity—a legislative enactment, Mr. President, which inevitably, it seems to me, would take away from our people the good things of life to which they have become accustomed, and reduce us to the economic standards of those countries from which, without an adequate protective tariff, our ruinous competition would come. The explanation of all this is beyond me. I give it up.

President Hoover in his Newark address, from which I quoted above, in which he deals with competitive tariffs as against protective tariffs, suggests to the workers in industries in New Jersey and all over this country that they should consider the effect on their jobs of decreased tariff protection. And, Mr. President, it is time that somebody suggested this same thought to the workers of this country again. It is time they asked themselves the question: "What is likely to be the effect on us of this slashing of the 1922 tariff rates which has been going on in the Senate of the United States for some time back?"

The workers in the industries of this country are no fools, and they are likely to pay particular attention to anything which strikes at their opportunity of earning a livelihood. Obviously the action of the coalition is doing just that. And it is time our workers in all industry realized it, and realized, too, that this attack on the tariff rates affecting their industries is being made at a time when these industries are in a particularly vulnerable position.

About two weeks ago the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] made a presentation on this floor with reference to the existing unemployment situation in this country and sought to lay this unemployment condition at the doorstep of the present administration. Mr. President, I do not know how many idle workers there are in this country to-day, and neither does the Senator from Wisconsin. Neither, in fact, does anyone. The Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] tells about walking down Sixth Avenue on a Sunday morning and noticing the crowds around the employment agencies, and he concludes that there is considerable unemployment. The Secretary of Labor, in a recent statement, estimated that there are 3,000,000 jobless workers in this country. The statistics gathered by the State industrial commission in New York State, which even the Senator from Wisconsin admits has the best statistics on unemployment available, indicates that 100,000 workers in the factories of that State have been laid off since last October, and, so far as New York State is concerned, Commissioner Perkins undertakes to say that the situation is "very serious."

Mr. President, this should be sufficient to indicate to anyone that industry in this country is not booming, that there is unemployment, and, whether it be a coincidence or not, this unemployment began to develop coincident with the Senate's consideration of the rate schedules in this proposed new tariff law. And I might add that the longer the Senate has considered these rate schedules, the worse the unemployment has become.

I am not going to say here that the Senate's consideration of this tariff bill is the one and only cause for the existing unemployment in this country. We always have some unemployment at this time of the year as a result of purely seasonal influences, and the end of the speculative mania last fall undoubtedly contributed some to our unemployment. But I am going to assert and reiterate here that the Senate's consideration of this pro-

posed new tariff bill has been a breeder of industrial uncertainty and that such industrial uncertainty must inevitably add to the unemployment of American labor.

The Senate of the United States, or, more accurately speaking, the coalition within the Senate of the United States, is in part responsible for the existing unemployment situation in this country by reason of the shameful delay in the consideration and passage of this proposed new tariff law. And add to that the developments since the 5th day of this month which have resulted in a slashing of many of the existing tariff rates, with the effect this slashing must inevitably have on the industries affected. The worker in American industry has an indictment against the Senate coalition which he certainly would be a fool not to press. And, as I have always said, the American workman is no fool!

There has been considerable speculation as to whether or not this proposed new tariff bill ever will be passed. It will be remembered that at least one Member of this body predicted several months ago that it ought never to be passed and that it never would be passed. And, Mr. President, many of the accomplishments of the Senate coalition which I have examined have happened since this prediction was made.

The coalition says it wants to pass this bill; various Members of the working majority in the Senate on both sides of the aisle have frequently said that they do not want to see this bill fail; that they want to see it passed; and I really think they mean it. I really think they want to pass this bill, but they want to pass it in their own time. They want to pass it, Mr. President, as shortly before the elections of this year as they possibly can manage. Oh, I know they will think that is telling on them, but that is just exactly what I propose to do, Mr. President.

I began by saying that we were a generation of "know-not Josephs" on the tariff, but there is a political aspect in the passage of tariff laws which I suspect is not unknown to some of my colleagues, however uninformed they may be on the economics of the tariff.

Mr. President, a new tariff law, however good it might ultimately prove to be, is always a disturbing influence to business when it goes into operation. Industries which for six or eight years previously have been adjusted to one set of tariff conditions find themselves confronted with the necessity of adjustment to a new set of tariff conditions. The rate on their raw product may have decreased or increased, and in consequence their costs are likely to be changed. Or a compensatory rate affecting a particular industry may have been readjusted and a change in price is necessary. In a dozen different ways industries must adjust to the new tariff, and such an adjustment is a disturbing influence. Industry slows up, workmen may be laid off temporarily, and the whole economic structure hesitates. But if, by skillful maneuvering, these effects can be held off until just before election, they become a powerful source of political appeal to the voters of this country.

Mr. President, in the light of all this, the coalition's strategy is quite simple; it narrows down to just two elementary political propositions: First, the proposed new tariff bill must be made at least to seem in the public mind to be a Republican measure. It must bear the name of a Republican Representative and a Republican Senator. It must be made to seem the fulfillment of the 1928 Republican tariff pledge. If these things can be done, the coalition can be trusted to make the public believe that here is a Republican tariff bill. The second proposition is just as simple. It calls for a little more delay, a few weeks will do, a month will be plenty. Then they will rush the bill through, send it to conference with the assurance that because of the outrageousness of many of the Senate amendments it would be weeks, probably months, before the conference committee can report it back. That will do it very nicely. Let the bill become law any time during, say, July or August, and, like Mark Antony, the coalition can sit back and say to itself:

Mischief, thou art afoot, take thou what course thou wilt!

How very simple. There is even a precedent for it. The best Republican tariff law ever passed was the McKinley bill of 1890, which was never given a fair test. The McKinley bill became operative on October 1, 1890, and the resulting economic disturbances caused the Republican Party the loss of the House in the elections of 1890 and both the Senate and the Presidency two years later.

Mr. President, three months ago the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] in a moment of rashness, tempered by responsiveness, spoke about responsibility and about the coalition assuming certain responsibilities. Well, that is just what they are going to do if it is within my power to bring it about.

First, Mr. President, the Republican character of the proposed Hawley-Smoot tariff law has been destroyed by the action of the majority of the United States Senate, which, as everybody knows, is not a Republican majority. It is a majority made up of Democrats and insurgents with the same tariff viewpoint as Democrats, and it is this majority which has written the proposed new tariff law so far as the United States Senate is concerned. Every vestige of this coalition's activity which remained in this bill if it were to become a law would stamp it as a coalition measure or a Democratic measure, or a hybrid measure, Mr. President, a mongrel, anything you will, so long as you do not regard it up to the present time as a Republican bill and a fulfillment of the Republican tariff pledge of 1928.

Second, Mr. President, the passage of this bill has been undoubtedly and unnecessarily delayed, so that every attempt made from now on to enact this measure into law in due course bears the stamp of a political maneuver for the coalition's sinister purpose—the defeat of the Republican Party. I close, Mr. President, with a second reading of the statement by the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] made on the floor of the Senate on November 9, 1929. I read:

But I do want to say, as I intimated a few days ago, that those whom some are disposed to term the "coalition" are really now in charge of the making of the bill. The responsibility is upon us. What the country wants, in my judgment, is speed. They have pretty well made up their minds as to the bill, generally speaking. In my judgment it is incumbent upon us to dispose of the bill as rapidly as we can, taking into consideration, of course, that there are some items which necessarily must be discussed. If we do not do so we will be held responsible from this time on for the delay. We can not escape that responsibility.

Thus spoke the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] early last November. Let him, or any other Member of the Senate coalition, explain and justify to the American people the actions of these coalition forces in the light of this statement by the alert and farseeing Senator from Idaho, made almost four months ago.

Mr. President, the lesson, yes, the edict, of the remote and the ever recent past is: Let the tariff alone and lower it only where it does not affect injuriously American labor. Do not destroy it. It has accomplished wonders and it will achieve the marvelous. It has fostered our industries, built up our manufactures, and opened our wildernesses to the hamlet, the village, and the town. It has bound our States and the continent with rails of steel. It has elevated our manhood, dignified and uplifted our labor, and educated our people. It has enabled us to perfect the grandest system of finance the world has ever yet enjoyed, and it has caused our credit to shine with the sun of civilization.

It has touched our barren, rugged hillsides and caused the waters of commercial prosperity to flow all over the land. It has illuminated our valleys with the leaping flames of our furnaces and caused them to kiss the mountain tops in their ascent to prosperity. It has made the hum of our factories sweet music to the ears of those who labor and toil, and if we sustain the American system, and I pray to God we may, then we shall preserve and elevate the American home, the American schoolhouse, the dignity, the ambition, and the independence of American labor, and the equality of American possibilities for the present as well as for the generations yet to come. If these American standards are continued and practiced, then the Republic of America will become the great altar stairs that will slope through the mortal struggles and disappointments of life up to God.

During the delivery of Mr. Goff's speech—

NANTICOKE RIVER BRIDGE, MARYLAND

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. GOFF. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The State Roads Commission of Maryland is very anxious to start the construction of a bridge in that State, and the legislature is not in session to give the authority to cross the Nanticoke River. If the Senator from West Virginia will yield, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 3193, to authorize the State Roads Commission of Maryland to construct a highway bridge across the Nanticoke River at Vienna in Dorchester County to a point in Wicomico County, be considered at this time.

Mr. GOFF. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. TYDINGS. It is the State roads commission, a State institution, which wants to begin the construction of the bridge.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3193) to authorize the State Roads Commission of Maryland to construct a highway bridge across the Nanticoke River at Vienna in Dorchester County to a point in Wicomico County, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

The amendments were, on page 1, line 6, after the word "construct," to insert "maintain, and operate"; in line 7, after the word "at," to insert "a point suitable to the interests of navigation at"; in line 8, after the word "County," to strike out "to a point in Wicomico County" and insert "Maryland"; and on page 2, after line 4, to insert an additional section to read:

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the State Roads Commission of Maryland, acting for and on behalf of the State of Maryland, and its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a highway bridge across the Nanticoke River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at Vienna in Dorchester County, Md., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the State Roads Commission of Maryland to construct a highway bridge across the Nanticoke River at Vienna in Dorchester County, Md."

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I desire to thank the Senator from West Virginia for his unfailing courtesy at all times, and particularly to-day.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 7998. An act to amend subsection (d) of section 11 of the merchant marine act of June 5, 1920, as amended by section 301 of the merchant marine act of May 22, 1928;

H. R. 8361. An act to further develop an American merchant marine, to assure its permanence in the transportation of the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9553. An act to amend sections 401, 402, and 404 of the merchant marine act, 1928.

After the conclusion of Mr. Goff's speech—

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 7998. An act to amend subsection (d) of section 11 of the merchant marine act of June 5, 1920, as amended by section 301 of the merchant marine act of May 22, 1928;

H. R. 8361. An act to further develop an American merchant marine, to assure its permanence in the transportation of the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9553. An act to amend sections 401, 402, and 404 of the merchant marine act, 1928.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mr. GREENE, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on to-day, March 1, 1930, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 875. An act authorizing C. N. Jenks, F. J. Stransky, L. H. Miles, John Grandy, and Bruce Machen, their heirs, legal representatives and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Savanna, Ill.;

S. 3197. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Morgan's Louisiana & Texas Railroad & Steamship Co., a corporation, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the Intracoastal Canal;

S. 3297. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River approximately midway between the cities of Owensboro, Ky., and Rockport, Ind.; and

S. 3405. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Decatur, Nebr.

CHANGES OF REFERENCE

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. President, early in January I introduced the bill (S. 3154) to provide for the erection of a suitable memorial to the memory of John James Audubon at Henderson, Ky. It appears that the bill was improperly referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. I now ask unanimous consent that that committee be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on the Library.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

On motion of Mr. NORBECK, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 3774) to amend the United States mining laws applicable to the national forests within the State of South Dakota, and it was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

PROPOSED RELIEF OF UNEMPLOYMENT SITUATION

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, in view of the great calamity which the coalition and the insurgents have brought upon the country, as disclosed by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Goff], I desire to introduce a joint resolution authorizing an appropriation of \$50,000,000 to relieve the unemployment situation of the United States. I want to turn this money over to President Hoover, the greatest administrator of relief in all the history of the world.

In the economic system of our country the burden of these depressions falls upon labor. We provide gigantic profits by the tariff laws, the banking laws, the railroad laws, and then when depression comes along the big men who get the benefit thereof discharge their labor, turn them out when they have nothing upon which to live except their labor, and the burden really in that way falls upon labor. It has been estimated that from 3,000,000 to 6,000,000 people are out of employment in these days of Republican prosperity. That is too many. Fifty million dollars will not go very far, but it will be a start, and in the hands of Mr. Hoover it will go farther than it would in the hands of anybody else. I therefore introduce the joint resolution and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. To what committee does the Senator desire to have the joint resolution referred?

Mr. BROOKHART. I think it should go to the Committee on Appropriations.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 149) for the relief of unemployed persons in the United States was read the first time by its title, the second time at length, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$50,000,000 to be expended by the American National Red Cross and the Quartermaster General of the Army, in such manner as the President shall by regulation prescribe, for the relief of unemployed persons throughout the United States.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, in connection with the matter of unemployment, to which reference has been made by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART], I desire to call attention to an editorial which appeared in the Washington Daily News of last evening, by Mr. Lowell Mellett, its editor. I do this for the reason that the Department of Justice has given out a statement in which it calls attention to communist uprisings that have taken place. I hope that the Department of Justice will not start on an era of red-baiting the same as was done during the administration of Palmer and likewise during the administration of Daugherty and Burns. There is a great deal of unemployment in the country. It is not going to be solved by policemen's clubs or by red-baiting by the Department of Justice. Every workman in the country has the right to work.

I call attention to the fact that it is claimed that we have had great prosperity in the country under the last administration and also under this administration. Mr. Hoover has called attention to the fact that he is going to carry out a great public-works program for the purpose of taking care of the unemployment situation. But since the issuance of that statement he has issued another statement warning the Congress against appropriations.

It should be noted, also, that many of the great industrial leaders who attended the conference called by the President of the United States, after coming down here with a blare of

trumpets and issuing statements to the effect that they were going to help unemployment in the country by keeping up their work, by extending their work, and not reducing wages, immediately went back to their places of business and laid off large numbers of men. This happened in almost every industry in the United States immediately after the conference which was called by the President of the United States.

I have been informed that when some of the industrial leaders came here they did not realize that there was such a depression in the United States as was outlined to them by the President at that time, and that because of the conference, instead of it having the effect of preventing unemployment, it has in reality caused further unemployment because it frightened some of the industrial leaders in the country into feeling that there was an industrial depression and that it was necessary to lay off some of their men.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Washington Daily News of last evening, a Scripps-Howard paper, may be inserted in the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The editorial is as follows:

THE RIGHT TO WORK

The communist unemployment demonstrations in half a dozen cities from coast to coast are not dangerous. The unemployment situation behind the demonstrations is dangerous.

No amount of police clubbing of communists is going to solve the unemployment problem. The communists are infinitesimal in numbers and influence in this country. They could be wiped out to-morrow—as so many conservatives hope they may be—and the political, social, and industrial conditions of the country would not be altered a particle.

There is something at once sinister and pathetic in the idea of some American officials that it is a crime to mention the word unemployment. They are like the people who would fight an epidemic by denying its existence.

Agitators do not cause unemployment. Unemployment causes agitators. Why shouldn't it? The right to work is inalienable.

If a man can not find work and if his family is hungry, what do we expect him to do? Make a speech on the blessings of prosperity?

If the unemployed do no more than parade to a city hall and plead for help, a city is lucky. The police should be glad that the weak and hungry are expressing their protest in such a harmless manner.

The trouble with us in America is that we have been self-righteous about our national prosperity for so long we now can not think straight and feel straight on the subject. We are acting as though a man out of work is a leper or a criminal.

The great army of unemployed to-day are not criminals. If anything criminal is involved it is the system which has created them.

The working people of this country were not made for our industrial system. The system was made for them. And, unless our system can provide steady work and a good living for the rank and file of the people, it is a rotten system which some day will fall of its own weight.

With all our talk about American efficiency, what are we doing to prevent this endless cycle of unemployment which swings back to mock our Government and curse our workers periodically? In the hard times of 1921 a national commission was appointed so that the tragedy would not happen again. But even the mild recommendations of that commission have never been acted upon.

For years these mild recommendations for Federal employment exchanges and statistics, and provision for spreading construction work over lean years, have been before Congress. But there has been no action, because the White House, the Congress, the chambers of commerce, the boosters, and the well fed have been hostile or indifferent.

Meanwhile every year the unemployment problem grows more serious as the advance of machines scraps human labor. At our recent peak of prosperity the unemployed numbered from one and a half to three millions. And now, during the temporary industrial recession, no man knows whether the number is four millions or six or seven.

We can not know the facts because we are the only great industrial nation in the world which fails to gather Federal unemployment statistics. To-day we can only guess at the truth from the reliable New York State figures, which show that this winter is the worst—except 1921—in 15 years.

We believe American conditions are fundamentally sound; that the potentialities of prosperity for all the people are greater in this land than in any other. But no prosperity is strong enough to withstand the creeping disease of unemployment unless the political and industrial leaders fight that disease honestly, intelligently, and courageously.

With the coming of spring we are passing out of the worst part of the depression. But depression will come again and again, next winter

or the following, unless we face and begin to conquer this industrial blight.

Indifference in this hour is treason.

The millions of men walking the streets to-day have a right to jobs. They should demonstrate. They should agitate. They should endeavor to awaken the Government to its responsibility.

INVESTIGATION OF OIL SITUATION IN MONTANA

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I desire to offer a resolution, which I send to the desk, calling upon the Attorney General of the United States to make an investigation into the oil situation as it exists in the State of Montana at this time. I hope that it will be immediately disposed of. It seems to me it should not lead to any debate, because I am merely asking that the Attorney General of the United States be requested to make an investigation into corporations and associations engaged in the business of selling oil and gasoline in the State of Montana for the purpose of determining whether or not any such companies or associations are fixing prices or engaging in other practices in violation of the Federal antitrust law.

In this connection let me say to the Senate that we have in Montana this situation: We are producing there a great deal of oil. We have refineries there which take the oil and refine it into gasoline. But notwithstanding the fact that the oil is produced in Montana and notwithstanding the fact that it is refined in Montana, I am informed that we are paying the highest rate, or practically the highest rate, for gasoline that is paid in any place in the United States. It is not necessary for the oil or gasoline companies to pay high freight rates because of the fact that they pipe the oil in many instances to their refineries. I am also informed, though I do not know this to be the fact, that the Standard Oil Co. fixes the price of gasoline and that the small independent oil companies are obliged to follow suit by reason of the fact that they are afraid if they do not do so and keep up the price of gasoline, they will be put out of business.

I am merely asking that the Attorney General of the United States make an investigation of the situation in the State of Montana with a view of determining whether or not there are any violations of the Sherman antitrust law there. I am doing this partly because of the fact that it has been taken up by chambers of commerce and partly because of numerous letters which I have received from farmers and other users of gasoline in the State of Montana, wondering why it is that in that State, where we produce the raw material and where we refine it, they have to pay these exorbitant prices for gasoline.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the resolution be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 220), as follows:

Resolved, That the Attorney General of the United States is hereby requested to make an investigation of the corporations and associations engaged in the business of selling oil and gasoline in the State of Montana for the purpose of determining whether any such corporations or associations are fixing prices or engaged in other practices in violation of the Federal antitrust laws.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I am going to ask the Senator to let the resolution go over for a day.

Mr. WHEELER. To let it go over until Monday?

Mr. FESS. Yes; until we have a little time to look into it.

Mr. WHEELER. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution goes over under the rule.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I have here an editorial relating to the original District of Columbia, which was 10 miles square, commenting upon the action of Congress in re-ceding about 80 years ago, one-third of the District. This is one of the most informing editorials I have seen, and it indicates the pride that people outside of the Capital have for the Capital. It has in it some very good suggestions. I shall not take the time to read it, but I would like to have it inserted in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The editorial is as follows:

[From the Columbus Dispatch]

SQUARING UP THE DISTRICT

The movement to restore the District of Columbia to its original form and area seems to be gaining ground. It was a shortsighted blunder on the part of Congress, in 1846, to pass the retrocession act by which part

of the District lying west of the Potomac was given back to the State of Virginia. The Senators and Representatives then in Congress, if they had stopped to think seriously at all, should have been able to foresee the time when the whole original tract of 10 miles square would be little enough for the Capital of the United States of America.

Now that the Capital Park and Planning Commission is getting well started on its task of adding beauty and stateliness to the city and giving it fitting surroundings, the mistake of cutting off so large a slice of the District is keenly realized. There are those who claim that Congress had no constitutional power to make this retrocession, and if the matter had been brought before the Supreme Court at the time, it seems quite possible that such would have been its decision; but after 84 years of acquiescence, it is not to be supposed that the court would now invalidate the act.

This does not mean, however, that there is no way to reverse the result of that hasty and unwise act. The inhabitants of the part that was thus ceded away seem willing, for the most part, to return, and it is suggested by some of those most active in the restoration movement that the General Assembly of Virginia, if a respectful request were made to it by the Federal Government, would cede the territory in question back again, as a tribute to the memory of George Washington, the most distinguished historical character, not only of Virginia but of the whole Nation.

If Congress were to make a unanimous request of that character to the Virginia General Assembly, backed, as it would be, by public sentiment all over the Nation, it seems quite unlikely that the Old Dominion would hold back. As a matter of legitimate and commendable State advertising, consent would be of great positive value, while refusal would be nothing but a dead loss.

To try to get this land back by a suit in the Supreme Court, however, as some are suggesting, would most likely create no little irritation in Virginia, instead of good feeling, and would in all probability result in an adverse decision anyhow. Virginia should be treated with complete respect and courtesy in the matter, for even the entire area of the original District, if restored, is not large enough for the program of the Park and Planning Commission, and Virginia's friendly cooperation, as likewise that of Maryland, is essential to the creation of appropriate surroundings for the Capital of our great Republic.

It is to be hoped that the matter will be pushed wisely, as well as energetically, that it may be consummated in time for the celebration of the two hundredth anniversary of Washington's birthday, in 1932. On a matter such as this, so far as congressional action is needed, Congress should show its essential patriotism, in spite of existing divisions, by coalescing into one solid bloc, without a single Member missing.

DISPOSITION OF PUBLIC DOMAIN

Mr. STEIWER. Mr. President, some time since the Governor of Oregon appointed a committee of very well-informed citizens of that State to make an investigation and report upon the proposal of the President to cede to the public-land States the surface rights of the public domain, a subject now being investigated by one of the presidential commissions. It is a matter of considerable importance to the West. I have here the report made by that Oregon committee as published in the Portland Oregonian of February 16, 1930. I send it to the desk and ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Portland Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., Sunday, February 16, 1930]

FEDERAL CONTROL OF LAND FAVORED—SUBCOMMITTEE MAKES REPORT TO GOVERNOR—GIFT OF DOMAIN REVIEWED—FOREST SERVICE URGED TO REGULATE GRAZING—GENERAL BODY TO MEET—STATES, SURVEY SHOWS, SHOULD GET EQUIVALENT TAXES ON UNRESERVED AREAS.

SALEM, OREG., February 15.—Retention by the Federal Government of unreserved lands whose surface rights President Hoover has suggested be turned over to Western States, provided the Government will agree to place regulation of grazing privileges on such lands under the Forest Service, is favored in a report released to-day by Governor Norblad. In the absence of any proposal that the Government itself will take regulation in hand, the report continued, the States might accept the offer, with the expectation of making measurably profitable use of the lands.

The report was compiled by a subcommittee of an Oregon committee appointed by the governor to obtain a cross-section of Oregon opinion on the President's proposal. Meetings of the general committee were held in Portland February 10 and 11, when leaders representing various interests of the State presented their views. The report will be submitted February 26 at a meeting of the general committee in Portland and, if approved, will be passed on to E. C. Van Patten, of Ontario, Oregon's representative on President Hoover's commission for study of public lands.

OREGON LAND CHIEFLY GRAZING

Approximately 13,000,000 acres in Oregon would be affected by the proposed action, of which about 11,000,000 acres, chiefly grazing land, is in the southeastern quarter of the State.

The subcommittee which drafted the report is composed of R. G. Callvert, chairman; William Doby, Robert N. Stanfield, Olin Arnsperger, and W. B. Snyder.

The following are some of the high lights of their recommendations:

That by reason of administrative machinery the Federal Government is best equipped to supervise and regulate the lands involved; that the Forestry Service should be enlarged into a forage preservation and utilization bureau, and that the grazing lands should be attached to the forests and that the forest system of grazing permits be extended to these areas.

TRANSFER NOT RECOMPENSE

That transfer to the States of barren Government lands should not be considered as recompense for loss to the State of taxable wealth through use by the Federal Government of natural resources of national forests, Indian reservations, national parks, and other reserved lands.

That Oregon and other Western States should receive the equivalent of taxes on reserved Government land.

That before lands are accepted by the States, certain areas should be withdrawn to protect watersheds and present and prospective reclamation.

That sale by the State of the ceded lands should be opposed to prevent private landholding monopolies and their use should be restricted to leasing or grazing rights.

That if subsurface rights are granted, States with petroleum resources would benefit at the expense of the general reclamation fund, of which Oregon is a beneficiary, and Oregon should have an adjusted compensation through adequate division of the proceeds of Government timber sales.

That all Federal land matters should be consolidated under the Secretary of Agriculture.

The full text of the committee's report follows:

"This committee met in Portland February 10 and 11, and after consultations with members of the field division of the General Land Office and a representative of the State board of higher education, makes the following statement as to the public-land situation in Oregon, together with its recommendations:

"The tentative proposal of the President of the United States made originally to the governors' conference at Salt Lake City last summer was that the Federal Government cede to the western land States, for the benefit of the public schools, the surface rights to unreserved and unappropriated public lands.

"The area of public lands in Oregon within this category is about 13,000,000 acres. Approximately 11,000,000 acres are situated in the southeastern portion of the State of Oregon and are used now, and probably always will be used, only for the grazing of livestock. The remainder of the unappropriated and unreserved public lands is scattered among several of the other counties, and in many instances is of a mountainous character. The utilization of these lands, therefore, is almost wholly a livestock or grazing problem.

GRAZING NOT REGULATED

"Under Government control there has never been any regulation of grazing privileges on these lands. They are not suitable for homesteading; they can not be fenced and only such tracts consisting of not more than 320 acres that are isolated from the main public range are subject to sale. Under unregulated grazing the forage grasses on these lands have been so tramped down and overgrazed that the lands are now capable of supporting only a fraction of the number of head of livestock that at one time subsisted upon them. In times past the natural water holes were taken up and have largely passed into private ownership. The problem of restoring these lands to their former forage capacity is, therefore, not solely one of regulating present grazing, but of providing water for the increased herds of livestock that the lands would be capable of sustaining. In Lake County the stockmen have been successful in obtaining water by drilling wells of moderate depth, and it is believed that with proper supervision and regulation, and development of water resources, a large part of the range lands can be restored to its former condition, to the end that the livestock industry would grow and greatly increase the taxable wealth and prosperity of this area.

"This committee wishes to emphasize that consideration of the President's proposal either by Congress or by the State of Oregon should not be on the basis that a cession of these lands to the State would be a valuable gift or in any sense a recompense to the State for its loss in taxable wealth through withdrawal of national forests, Indian reservations, national parks, and other reserved public lands. But, on the contrary, should be considered only as a release by the Government to the States of land which the Government itself has for many years permitted to retrograde until now its value is only potential and can

only be restored by laws carefully enacted and probably at considerable expense.

VARIOUS QUESTIONS ANSWERED

"The purpose of the general conference is to provide E. C. Van Petten, the representative of this State on the President's commission, with a cross section of public opinion in Oregon as to the President's proposal. Mr. Van Petten has submitted to the subcommittee several questions which the committee will answer seriatim.

"1. If Oregon should accept surface rights only, should it be with or without withdrawals to protect watersheds and present and prospective reclamation?

"It is the opinion of the committee that if Oregon should elect to accept the surface rights only, a survey should be made of the lands, and that such tracts as are desirable for protection of watersheds, or are available for inclusion in present or prospective reclamation projects, should be withdrawn by the Federal Government, and that such units as are useful to the Forestry Department for administering forest grazing areas, and are not contiguous to other grazing lands, should also be withdrawn or attached to the contiguous forest areas.

"2. Should the public lands be given to the States with no mineral reservations? If so, there is cut in half the annual accretion to the reclamation fund. Suggest a source of replacement of this loss.

"It is the opinion of the committee that, by reason of the existence of necessary administrative machinery in the Federal Government, the Federal Government is best equipped to supervise and regulate the lands whose surface rights the President suggests be turned over to the States. The committee believes that the best solution of the problem is the enlargement of the Forest Service into a forage preservation and utilization bureau, and that the grazing lands should be attached to the forests and that the forest system of grazing permits be extended to these areas with such extensions or modifications as may be demanded by the need for utilization.

MONOPOLY DANGER SEEN

"It is the opinion of the committee that a grant of the lands to the States without mineral reservations is a less desirable alternative than Government retention with regulation, but that in the absence of any proposal that the Government itself will take regulation in hand, the States could make a measurably profitable use of the lands. That any grant of surface rights to the States should be conditioned upon issuance of leasing or grazing rights, and not of sale except as to isolated tracts. To offer these lands for sale would result in their concentration in the hands of monopolistic landowners and prevent the growth of population and community centers.

"There will be an insistence by those Western States that have known petroleum resources that any grant of public lands to the States include the subsurface rights. At present Oregon produces no governmental royalties on mineral resources, but the royalties that accrue in other States from this source are placed almost wholly in the reclamation fund, of which the State of Oregon is a large beneficiary. To grant the States the subsurface rights would cut in half the yearly accretion to the reclamation fund. If the presidential committee should be disposed to recommend that the grant include the subsurface rights, or if Congress should be inclined to make such a grant, then Oregon should demand that it be similarly compensated by apportionment to Oregon for the use by Oregon in reclamation and in restoration of the depleted grazing lands or other public use of an adequate proportion of the revenues derived from the sale of timber in the national forests and in the Oregon and California land grant. It is the conviction of this committee that if States having subsurface resources are to be granted those resources, then Oregon should have a compensating grant of surface resources other than the surface of grass lands.

GOVERNMENT SHOULD PAY

"3. Should the public lands, if given to the States, include the national forest reserves?

"This committee believes that the national forests should be retained under Federal administration, but that the present allocation of 25 per cent of timber-sale proceeds is wholly inadequate to compensate the State for the loss of taxable wealth occasioned by the Government's withdrawal of these lands from individual acquisition. We believe that with or without a grant of any public lands the national forests should be appraised, and that the tax base should be determined as if the lands were in private ownership, and that the State and counties should be paid out of the proceeds of timber sales an amount equivalent to taxes.

"4. If the surface rights are desirable for Oregon, or are not desirable, state how can the livestock interests best be served in either case.

"This committee has already answered the question in so far as it pertains to retention by the Government of public lands in question. It has also stated that, in the event the lands are to be granted to the State, right of sale by the State should be prohibited except as to isolated tracts. It believes that the State law passed in 1923, providing a method of organizing grazing districts in the several coun-

ties, offers a foundation for county supervision which would measurably restore the forage capacity of the lands in question and encourage the drilling of wells by private enterprise.

CONSOLIDATION FAVORED

"5. If a citizen has business with the Federal Government on public-land matters, he may have to go to five bureaus in the Interior Department or to the Bureau of Forestry in the Department of Agriculture. Should the Public Land Office, Geological Survey, and Geodetic Survey be consolidated into one bureau and under what department?

"The national parks are supervised by the Interior Department and the Forestry Bureau is under the Agricultural Department. Should they be under one secretary and which one?

"The committee believes that all public-land matters should be consolidated under one department and it believes that, because the Agricultural Department has erected the larger detailed machinery, land matters should be placed under the Secretary of Agriculture.

"As a further report, the committee expressed the opinion that the proposal of direct revenues to the public-school fund from the grant of these lands to the State is somewhat remote and intangible. The public schools would, however, benefit from the increase in taxable wealth due to the existence of many more head of livestock upon a restored public range, and it is possible that in time lease or permit revenues would exceed the cost of administration.

"It is the purpose of the committee to attempt to obtain a rough valuation of the lands involved in the President's proposal. If obtained in time it will be submitted to Mr. Van Petten and otherwise will be at the disposal of the Oregon delegation in Congress.

"Respectfully submitted.

"R. G. CALLVERT,
"WILLIAM DUBY,
"ROBERT N. STANFIELD,
"OLIN ARNSPARGER,
"W. B. SNYDER."

TENDENCY OF SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Philadelphia Record of February 25, 1930, entitled "Is the Supreme Court to Fix the Prices of Necessaries of Life?"

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Record of February 25, 1930]

IS THE SUPREME COURT TO FIX THE PRICES OF NECESSARIES OF LIFE?

With fitting solemnity Charles Evans Hughes was sworn in yesterday as Chief Justice of the United States.

For him the moment was the crowning triumph of a distinguished career. To have attained this exalted place, as head of one of the three coordinate branches of the Government, is an achievement that may compensate him even for the loss of the Presidency after it seemed to be in his grasp.

And his gratification may well be the deeper because of the extraordinary tributes paid to his qualifications for the high office, in character, intellect, and legal stature. The most determined critics of the appointment never questioned his fitness in these respects.

Nor is there the remotest doubt that his attitude as a jurist will conform to the best traditions of the country's highest tribunal.

It may be assumed that he will avoid consideration of any suits in which he has appeared as an advocate. But no member will be more conscientious in applying in all cases that come before him those legal conceptions which his knowledge and experience persuade him are sound.

Yet the conspicuous claims of the new Chief Justice upon public confidence do not signify that the protests against his nomination were without merit or that the issue which provoked those objections has been erased from the public mind.

A judge may be profoundly learned, intellectually honest, utterly sincere, and yet hold extralegal concepts which, shaped in judicial decisions, would tend to the defeat of public desires and the impairment of public rights.

What the Senate discussed—legitimately, we think—was this question: Can any lawyer who has been for years the outstanding champion of monopolistic enterprises against regulation or restriction become overnight an impartial adjudicator, concerned equally for property rights and human rights under the law?

By a vote of 2 to 1 the Senate answered affirmatively for Mr. Hughes, and his numberless admirers look confidently for him to justify the verdict.

But it is important to note that the underlying issue remains, which was only incidentally the bent of Mr. Hughes's mind, the real matter of concern being the tendencies exhibited by the Supreme Court itself. Senatorial critics cited many instances in which, according to their view, that tribunal had ruled to the detriment of the public interest.

But the most serious complaint was not that the court has decided incorrectly upon specific laws but that it has attempted in effect to change established laws and make new ones, and especially that it has gone outside the field of law and assumed to apply social and economic theories, as to which it has no legitimate authority.

That issue arises most sharply in the matter of public-utility regulation, and a recent decision furnished the strongest argument the anti-Hughes group had.

The street-railway company in Baltimore, a monopoly, asked for an increase in fare from 7½ cents to 10 cents. The public service commission granted a rate of 8½ cents—four tokens for 35 cents, upon the ground that this would yield 6.26 per cent on the property, a return held adequate in most State laws.

The Maryland Court of Appeals upheld the commission, but the Supreme Court of the United States reversed it. The majority opinion brushed aside the State authorities in this fashion:

"A return of 6.26 per cent is clearly inadequate. It is not certain that rates securing a return of 7½ or even 8 per cent would not be necessary to avoid confiscation."

Three justices as firmly declared, on the contrary, that the 6.26 rate is adequate, especially since the return is 6.70 per cent, if there is deducted from the valuation a franchise which the public conferred free and which the company capitalizes at \$5,000,000!

As the Baltimore Sun notes, there is not a word in the Constitution to indicate whether the return of a public utility should be 6, 7, or 8 per cent. In fact, the Supreme Court long refused to rule on this question, declaring that it was a legislative matter. But now it "has ceased to deal with fixed principles of law and has become a body of economists."

"Carried to its logical conclusion, that decision," it was said in the Senate, "means the destruction of all regulatory power over public utilities by State legislatures, courts, and commissions."

Certainly it signifies that the Supreme Court and not the responsible State agencies will in effect determine what charges every citizen shall pay for the services he gets from the public utilities to which his community has granted monopolies.

Thus the opposition to Mr. Hughes was not personal.

It was an expression of dissent from a far-reaching purpose, maintained by a 6 to 3 majority of the Supreme Court, to act as a board in economics as well as a tribunal of law, and to fix the prices which the people shall pay for necessities of life.

That's an issue which will outlive the honorable tenure of the new Chief Justice.

RECESS

Mr. FESS. I move that the Senate take a recess, the recess being until Monday morning at 11 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, in accordance with the order previously entered, until Monday, March 3, 1930, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, March 1, 1930

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou, whose hand lifts the curtain of the morning, to-day, as we face duty and responsibility, may we stand erect. If at evening time we have failed may we take comfort in the realization that in the depths of a good, clean conscience there is no such thing as failure. In every situation may we be men of good report, men who never wrong a fellow and always prompt to help a friend. O Thou, who speaks to us in the silence of the mountains, we pray that wherever the light breaks and the sunshine falls that all may be happy and wise and put a bow of promise in the bosom of every cloud. In the holy name of the world's Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Mr. THATCHER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. CHARLES FINLEY, who was recently elected to succeed Senator ROBSION, former Congressman from the eleventh district of Kentucky, is present. Following the precedents in such cases I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to appear at the bar of the House and take the oath. His credentials have not been received, but there is no question about his election. It is conceded that he is elected and there is no contest whatever. Therefore, I ask that he be allowed to take the oath.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, there is no question from any source about his election?

Mr. THATCHER. There is no question from any source whatsoever.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINLEY appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office prescribed by law.

ADDRESS OF GEN. FRANK T. HINES, DIRECTOR OF THE VETERANS' BUREAU

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an address delivered by Gen. Frank T. Hines to the veterans relative to Government insurance available to veterans.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting an address by General Hines. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House I offer for the RECORD an important and informing radio address to the veterans by Gen. Frank T. Hines, Director of the Veterans' Bureau, over WRC, at the National Press Building, on February 28, 1930, relative to Government insurance available to veterans.

The address is as follows:

VETERANS' UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT LIFE INSURANCE

I am glad to have this opportunity of calling to the attention of the veterans of the World War the importance of taking advantage of the opportunity the Government extends them for applying for Government insurance.

I am impressed from questions that are put to me from time to time by veterans, and statements to the effect that they regret that they permitted their insurance to lapse, that there exists at this time a misunderstanding relative to Government life insurance. Usually when we think of Government life insurance we associate it with the war-time term insurance or war-risk insurance, as it is better known among the veterans, and many veterans have probably overlooked the fact that the Congress has made it possible, by an amendment to the World War veterans' act, to apply for United States Government life insurance in sums ranging from \$1,000 to \$10,000, in multiples of \$500.

More than 11 years have elapsed since the close of the World War. War-time insurance has been discontinued, but the Government still offers the privilege to those veterans who once held war-risk insurance to apply for United States Government life insurance, converted insurance, as it is best known, even at this time.

There is no need for me to remind the thousands of veterans of the necessity of their providing for old age or their dependents. Those now settled in civil pursuits, undoubtedly, have assumed additional responsibility requiring them to give consideration, not only to the possible condition that may exist in their old age but for the protection and care of their families. I know of no more advantageous or desirable method of creating an estate or meeting this obligation than through United States Government life insurance. This insurance provides a safe investment of funds for future needs, financial aid to the veteran in case of permanent and total disability from any cause, and in the event of his death financial assistance to his dependents.

A veteran of the World War, who is now in good health, is privileged to procure any one or more of the following seven plans of insurance: Five-year convertible term, ordinary life, 20 or 30 year payment life, 20 or 30 year endowment, and endowment maturing at the age of 62 years. The premium rates are most advantageous, since they are net rates without any overhead expense, the Government bearing all the cost of administration. The policies are issued free from restrictions as to residence, travel, or occupation, and include a permanent and total disability clause which is without limit as to the age before which disability must occur, for which there is no additional premium charge.

The 1930 dividend being paid to the policyholders of United States Government life insurance is materially increased over the dividends paid in previous years and this is a positive indication of the sound basis upon which the insurance is being conducted by the Government.

To facilitate the handling of this insurance the United States Veterans' Bureau recently has completed its program of decentralizing certain phases of the work to the regional office in each State, and it is the intention of the bureau to further decentralize other insurance activities with a view to bringing the facilities of the bureau in closer contact with the policyholders, and simplifying the processes in administering this important phase of veteran relief. Every Veterans' Bureau regional office in the country is now equipped to accept applications for new or additional insurance and to make the necessary physical examinations of applicants free of charge.

If you are a veteran of the World War and are not now protected by United States Government life insurance, I urge you to write or to apply to the nearest regional office or to the bureau here in Washington, D. C., for insurance in such amount as you are financially able to carry. If you are now protected by United States Government life insurance for an amount less than the \$10,000 maximum, I recommend that you increase the amount of your insurance from time to time commensurate with your financial ability and added responsibilities.

From the converted-insurance fund the Government has, up to January 1, 1930, allowed claims to a commuted value of \$93,500,000. While 870,000 have applied for converted insurance, there was in force on December 31, 1929, 648,392 policies, amounting to \$3,049,000,000.

The present financial status of the converted-insurance fund is excellent. Suitable reserves have been maintained to meet all contingencies, and over and above, a liberal rate of dividends is being maintained.

Since the decentralization of insurance activities to the regional offices there has been a noticeable increase in the number of applications for new insurance, and in the number of applications for additional insurance. The veterans' organizations interested in improving the condition of the veterans of the World War recognize the value of this insurance and are urging their members and all World War veterans with whom they come in contact to avail themselves of this protection.

I feel that many veterans, hearing this radio talk, will avail themselves of the privilege to obtain Government life insurance who otherwise may never have been informed of this right, and I want to thank the National Broadcasting Co. for its cooperation in extending its facilities for this purpose.

THE MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 9592, to amend section 407 of the merchant marine act, 1928.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine calls up a bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 407 of the merchant marine act, 1928, be amended by striking out the period at the end thereof, inserting a colon, and adding the following: "Provided, however, That should the purchaser from the United States of a steamship line heretofore or hereafter established by the United States Shipping Board and operated on a route certified by the Postmaster General under the terms of section 402 make application and submit a proposal (conforming to the specifications) for the contract for carrying the mails thereon, the Postmaster General, without advertisement for bids, shall award the contract for such route to said purchaser on the proposal submitted and without regard to any other proposal, if (1) in the opinion of the Postmaster General said purchaser possesses (with the aid of contract so to be awarded) such qualifications as to insure proper performance of the mail service under said contract, (2) if the compensation does not exceed the maximum rates authorized by section 409, and (3) if the Shipping Board by the affirmative vote, duly recorded, of four members thereof shall determine that the awarding of the contract to such purchaser is in the public interest and will aid in carrying out the purposes of the merchant marine act, 1920, and the merchant marine act, 1928, and shall so certify to the Postmaster General."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, after line 3, insert "(U. S. C., title 26, sec. 891; 45 Stat. L., pt. 1, p. 694)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. What is the status of the bill?

The SPEAKER. The bill is before the House and is in charge of the gentleman from Maine, who is entitled to one hour.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman has not asked permission to have this bill considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. That is not necessary because it is a House Calendar bill. The gentleman from Maine is recognized for one hour.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I offer another committee amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITE: Page 2, lines 1 and 2, after the word "proposal" in line 1, strike out the words in parentheses, "conforming to the specifications," and insert in lieu thereof the words "conforming to the certification of the Postmaster General and the determination of the Shipping Board under sections 402 and 403."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, may we have the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine again reported by the Clerk?

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine.

There was no objection.

The Clerk again reported the amendment.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, this bill comes before the House with the unanimous approval of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries and is designed to harmonize existing provisions of the 1920 merchant marine act and section 407 of the 1928 act, known as the merchant marine act of 1928.

In order to understand the pending amendment it is necessary to have in mind at least two of the basic purposes of the 1920 merchant marine act. As a result of the experiences of the war and of the congestion in traffic which ensued during that period in certain great ports of the United States it was forced upon the attention of the Merchant Marine Committee that there was urgent necessity of an equitable distribution of steamship services throughout the length and breadth of our entire coast line, and one of the purposes of the 1920 act was to work out an equitable distribution of steamship services along the Atlantic coast, along the Gulf, and along the Pacific coast of the United States. Then as an aid in effectuating that purpose it was provided in section 7 of the 1920 act that when ships owned by the Government and in the hands of operators were put up for sale by the Government, the operators primarily interested in those lines should have a preference as against all others in the purchase of those lines.

Now, if I may illustrate this, let me do it in this way: The thought of that preference of section 7 of the 1920 act was that if there was an operator at Charleston or Mobile who had been operating ships for the Government of the United States, who had built up his operating personnel, who had brought together his trade-gathering facilities within this country and in the ports of the world to which his ships ran; if he had acquired a good will, if he had his capital investment, whatever it might be, it was thought, in the interest of the entire merchant marine, that this man should have a positive preference when it came to purchasing ships from the Government. So section 7 of the 1920 act was written in the law, in part, as I say, to effectuate the purpose of a distribution of services throughout the length and breadth of our coast and to get away from the congestion which we had suffered in the immediately preceding years.

When we wrote the 1928 mail-title section we provided with respect to contracts for mails that bids should be submitted, and that contracts should be awarded to the lowest bidder possessing the qualifications for carrying on the service.

It has been contended by many that there is a lack of harmony between that present provision of section 407 and these basic purposes of the 1920 act, because of the fact that if the lowest bidder in all circumstances is to receive this mail award, it might be that when a line down in New Orleans is sold, a man might come down from New York and underbid the purchaser of that line, acquire the mail contract, and defeat the basic purpose of the 1920 act, that there should be a distribution of the services along our entire coast line.

So this amendment is presented in order to write into the merchant marine act of 1928, into this mail-contract title, the same theory and the same principle of preference that is given in the 1920 act in section 7. The section simply provides that where a purchaser of a service established by the United States—and please bear in mind that these are all essential services for the movement of the commerce of the United States—submits a bid conforming to certain specifications we have written into the law, there shall be a mandatory preference to him, and that he shall receive the mail contract under section 407.

Now, why do we do this? We do this, as I say, because we want to be sure that of the essential services established by the United States, of which 20 have now been sold, they shall be successfully and profitably operated and shall not be dumped back onto the United States Government to run in the future. Then with respect to the 18 services now being maintained by the Government, not yet sold, we want to make sure that this operator, having the support of the local community, when he buys that line, is going to get the mail contract, if it is found by the Postmaster General to be an essential mail route. We want to make sure he is going to get this contract, because by so doing we think we are furthering the sales of the remaining services now operated by the Government. We think we are offering a tremendous inducement to get these steamship services out of the hands of the Government and into the hands of

private operators, which is one of the aims of the 1920 law. Now, that is all there is to this amendment.

We have provided certain safeguards. We have provided that before a contract shall be let, the Postmaster General must be satisfied of the capacity of the purchaser to perform the service. We make certain, because we leave unchanged the original provision of law, that it is an essential mail route. We place no added obligations upon the Postmaster General to certify any route as an essential mail route. We provide that the contract price shall be within the limits fixed in the 1928 act, and that the Shipping Board shall find and certify before this preference is given, that the awarding of the contract is in furtherance of the purposes of the 1920 and 1928 acts.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. Does the gentleman want to ask me a question?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes; we are about to establish a very important ocean line from Baltimore. Suppose they want to carry the mail from Baltimore; could a New York concern come to our city and underbid our line, or will the Baltimore concern be given the preference?

Mr. WHITE. Under existing law, if you have an operator running from Baltimore who desires to purchase ships from the Government, and he does so purchase, and that line is set up and designated as an essential mail line, a man from New York or a man from San Francisco can come in and underbid your domestic operator and get the mail contract away from you; and the purpose of this amendment is to make sure that the Baltimore operator, who has given of his time and of his skill and of his money to the development of that line, shall receive that mail contract. Then we put in a limitation—

Mr. LINTHICUM. Then, under the amendment, we would receive a preference and they could not come in and bid against us.

Mr. WHITE. You would receive a definite and effective preference if this amendment is written into the law.

Mr. PATTERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

Mr. PATTERSON. Can the gentleman give any instance of where that has been done?

Mr. WHITE. I do not want, as the boys say, to hold out anything on the House—

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Tell them about the Mississippi Shipping Co.

Mr. WHITE. The case that has brought this acutely to the front and made it a live issue in our committee, and perhaps in the country, is the case of the Mississippi Shipping Co. The Mississippi Shipping Co. for a number of years operated a line running out from the Gulf and bought that line in the belief and in the understanding that it was to get a mail contract. Then when the route was certified as an essential mail route, down from New York comes a bidder and underbids this local operator running out of the Gulf. This is the situation which has brought this matter acutely to the front, and we want, if we may do so by this legislation, to make sure that the man in the Gulf who has been developing this service, who has the loyalty and the support of the local community, shall be the one who gets that mail contract, if it is a proper case for a mail contract.

Mr. BLAND. Did not the Mississippi Shipping Co. have behind it the shipping interests of the Mississippi Valley?

Mr. WHITE. It did.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. It had behind it the shipping interests but it did not have the ships.

Mr. WHITE. Oh, yes; it had ships which it had bought of the Government of the United States under at least an implied agreement that it should have the contracts for carrying the mail.

Mr. DAVIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. The Mississippi Shipping Co. bought the service, the ships, and paid a higher price than was paid for cargo ships since the war, and was under the American flag. Last year it made 29 round trips between New Orleans and the coast of South America and had the indorsement of every organization in New Orleans and the Mississippi Valley and throughout the Middle West.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Did the ships have sufficient speed to carry first-class mail?

Mr. DAVIS. Just as efficient as the ships bought by the competitive bidders, because they both bid under the same specifications, and this company was required to build four new and larger and speedier vessels.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. The gentleman will agree that one of the main purposes of the Jones-White Act was to build up the American ships and bring about new tonnage. I note that in the list of 25 contracts already granted, many call for no new construction. I would like to ask the gentleman if he can inform us exactly what is the obligation as to new construction, as to whether there must be new construction to secure the mail contract.

Mr. WHITE. I can not answer the question categorically, but I can answer the gentleman generally. I made the general statement yesterday that by 25 mail contracts there are 17 new vessels and the reconditioning and improvement of 22 other vessels required, and for 12 lines for which contracts are now called for there is an obligation to build 40 additional ships in American yards. With reference to those 40 vessels, the expenditure will total more than \$175,000,000.

That amount may not seem like a tremendous volume of construction, when we compare it with what is going on elsewhere in the world, but as I pointed out yesterday, from 1922 to 1927 there has not been built in American yards in all that time a single ship to fly our flag in the overseas trade. I think that is a tremendous advance.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Out of these 25 mail contracts already awarded only 18 call for new construction, and all the 17 new ships are to be built by 7 contractors. What I am asking is why it is in the 18 contracts there is no new construction?

Mr. WHITE. An answer to that question would require detailed knowledge of each case.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WHITE. I will yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. LEHLBACH. In answer to the gentleman from New York I will say in certain contracts where new construction is not required they are operating new ships. It depends on the quality of the ship.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman, who is so familiar with this law, tell us exactly what the nature of the legal obligation is, or whether there is any legal obligation; or is it purely a matter of discussion with the Postmaster General and the Shipping Board as to whether these contracts shall contain any positive provision for new construction?

Mr. WHITE. Under the law as it is written it is within the authority of the Postmaster General to write the terms of these contracts. The Congress did not assume to write into the law arbitrary provisions applicable to the varying facts and circumstances of each of these cases, but we did write into the law the authority to require new construction, and I think the law makes plain the purpose of Congress that the Postmaster General shall be diligent and exacting in requiring new construction.

Mr. LEHLBACH. And furthermore, under section 403 of the law, after a route has been certified, is it not the duty of the Shipping Board to examine and certify as to the kind and quality of the ship and the size and speed of the vessel?

Mr. WHITE. Absolutely.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Since the discussion yesterday I have been thinking about this matter which has just been referred to by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT], and I have one or two questions I want to ask the chairman of the committee. In the first place, should not the basic factor in these contracts, where the compensation under them is sufficient, look toward new construction?

Mr. WHITE. There are many factors that enter into it. First, we are getting our mail carried. These people who have these contracts are under a definite and positive obligation to be ready and able to carry the mail whenever called upon by the Postmaster General upon regular services. Then, we require that the ships must either be constructed according to plans and specifications approved by the Navy Department, and so be vessels available for military purposes, or that they must be vessels now in existence useful in time of emergency. Then we provide that they must carry a larger percentage of Americans in the crew than is required of any other vessels of the United States, and then, because of the fact that we wrote into the law that these ships might be taken at any time by the Government, we wrote a limitation upon the liability of the Government for compensation. All those factors enter into it, in addition to the obligation to move the mail. Getting back to the gentleman's question, I do think that there is a heavy and a solemn obligation resting upon the Post Office Department in

all proper cases and to the very limit to demand new construction.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Does the gentleman think that solemn obligation has been on the whole lived up to in previous contracts?

Mr. WHITE. I hate to make a general statement about it, but I must. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH] gave the answer to that. There were some cases where the ships in operation and with respect to which contracts were let were new ships, built within 10 years, and in those cases there was no necessity for immediately demanding new construction, but in all other cases, and speaking generally, I would say that the Post Office Department, and certainly the present Postmaster General, has gone the limit in demanding new construction, and I commend him for that.

Mr. LEHLBACH. And furthermore, if the gentleman will permit, in such cases where immediate construction was not necessary or reasonable, is it not a fact that in such contracts the term of the contract was made for only five years instead of 10 years, with notice to the contractor that on renewal there must be new construction?

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman is right.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. But in the meantime they got the subsidy.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Is it fair that Government money should go into the Treasury of this or that shipping concern in excess of the requirement to make it a going concern by covering operating deficits and amortization of investment, and a reasonable return, say, 8 per cent on the investment?

Mr. WHITE. It all depends on what you want to accomplish. If you want new ships built in American yards, ships that are able to compete with the vessels of the world and of the trade, then I think it is a proper expenditure of public money. One of the great developments in transportation in these later years has been the insistence on speed as a factor in transportation. The railroads of the country have spent hundreds of millions of dollars in eliminating grades, wiping out curves, and improving railroad rolling stock, all in the interest of speed in the transportation of commodities and persons; and the highways of concrete and cement that stretch over the country are nothing but an answer of the American people to the demand for speed in transportation on land; and it is precisely so on the sea. If we do not build new ships with speed, we will be outdistanced in this race for the commerce of the world before we start.

Mr. DAVENPORT. If the compensation under the contract should exceed the total of these items I mention, namely, operating deficits, amortization of investment and a reasonable return, say, 8 per cent, should the excess not be credited on future payments or applied to new ship construction?

Mr. WHITE. I think it is in all cases.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Does the gentleman think it should be?

Mr. WHITE. I think it is. Some of these companies are not only taking the 8 per cent, but they are setting aside the whole compensation for new construction in American yards.

Mr. LEHLBACH. The soul of the contract is not entirely new construction, but it is also operation.

Mr. WHITE. We have here two purposes. We have to make sure that these ships shall be successfully operated in the foreign trade, we want to make sure that the companies shall be going concerns, that they are a success, and that the ships are not dumped back on us; and the next consideration is the building of new tonnage.

Mr. DAVENPORT. In view of the fact, Mr. Chairman, that some Postmasters General seem to live up to this solemn obligation and some do not, let me ask the gentleman whether in his bill there should not be some such provision as this:

Provided, however, That if the aggregate of the compensation in any year exceeds the amount of the deficit for such year, if any, resulting from the maintenance of the shipping services involved, such excess or, if there be no deficit, then the amount of the compensation thus paid shall either be credited on subsequent payments which may become due by the United States under such contract or shall be invested in the construction of new vessels of a type and kind approved by the Secretary of the Navy and by the United States Shipping Board. The computation to ascertain annually what, if any, deficit has accrued shall conform to the accounting practices of the trade, including the usual annual allowance for depreciation in the value of the vessel involved and a reasonable profit or return, not exceeding 8 per cent, on the capital invested; such new vessels, immediately on completion, to be put under and thereafter retained under the American flag.

The shipping industry under the merchant marine act is so closely related to the Government that it is profoundly affected with a public interest. Should not some such check as proposed in this amendment be added to the bill now before the

House, in order to prevent the loose and careless financing methods and policies which have prevailed to such an extent in Shipping Board and postal contract matters in the recent past? The present Postmaster General is exceedingly careful. But in view of what has happened under one Postmaster General or another, and in view of what may happen again, ought not some such amendment as I have suggested go into this bill?

Mr. WHITE. You have read me a long amendment the purport of which I am not sure of. I would say, generally, that I think some confidence must be placed in the officers of the Government, and if we try to write into the law provisions that are to apply to every possible contingency, then you will have a law so rigid that nobody can operate under.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there for a question?

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma. I am now, and have been for many years, much interested in the building and the development of an American merchant marine. That may be unusual in a Congressman from the interior of the country, for it is a long time since the people living in the interior have been indifferent to or prejudiced and opposed against Government help for the merchant marine. I can not find it in my make-up to take a local or provincial attitude on a matter of so great national importance.

Feeling as I do I would deeply regret to see legislation enacted here that would result in further failure in achieving our purpose in building up an American-owned fleet, whether the failure be due to inherent faults of the law or to admitted bad administration thereof.

All forward-looking men who take the broad view and the far look recognize the importance of having American ships built of American material in American shipyards, manned by Americans, paying the American wage scale, and carrying the products of American labor, whether from factory or farm, to every port in the world.

But appealing as such an idea is to our patriotism, men will not and should not invest money in admittedly losing enterprises. That is why its great national importance justifies Government aid and assistance.

The mere spending of money, however, may not result in giving us a merchant marine. The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] yesterday detailed to the House how, under the administration of the present law, the Government was reconditioning its old ships, then selling them to operators for much less than it costs to recondition them, and then giving these operators a subsidy designed as a mail-carrying contract to get them to buy the ships and operate them.

If a subsidy is justified, and it is justified, for without Government help there will be no American ships, why not call it a subsidy and write definitely into the law the requirements and obligations that the shipping companies will have to meet in order to be entitled to the subsidy, specifying the number, kind, character, and speed of the ships to be built and the subsidy to be paid both as to the cost of the ship and the cost of operation on each type? The money that is appropriated and spent for this purpose should be so safeguarded that we will get the result that we are paying for, but what do you have now?

You have the Government, under this legislation, through the Post Office Department, giving fat contracts calling for payment of large sums of money to carry the United States mail when everybody concerned knows that the ship will carry little mail and in some instances none at all. This has been an invitation to forward-looking designing gentlemen to go into the shipping business, not to build up a merchant marine but to get hold of these old tubs and use them as an excuse to get these new-thought, un-Christian, unscientific, make-believe mail-carrying contracts. We are paying them to do something which we know and they know they are not expected to do.

Private interests that are entitled to receive public help should enter the Treasury through the front door and should not come through some side door or basement entrance of some other department. If we are going to give ship subsidies to get ships built and operated, let us call it a subsidy and get the ships, instead of bootlegging the funds out of the Treasury under the guise of phoney mail-carrying contracts. The doing of this thing by indirection affords the opportunity and temptation for its abuses. This is no reflection on our present able, honest, and outstanding Postmaster General. His business is to run the Post Office Department. It is not to build up a merchant marine.

Yesterday the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] gave a recital of the Government's history dealing with some

of these ship experiences which reminded me of nothing so much as of a wealthy father who was anxious to marry off an old-maid daughter. Some irresponsible tramp comes along and he makes rosy promises of taking over the unmarried daughter provided the father will dress her up and endow her with an ample dowry. The trouble is the tramp is not responsible and there is nothing back of his promises, and when the endowment is gone and the annual subsidy for keeping up the new home stops, the tramp steps out of the picture with the profits and the father takes back the maiden daughter much worse for the wear and with nothing to show for all of his outlay. [Laughter.]

A sound permanent national policy to build up the merchant marine will not survive if public sentiment and confidence is weakened or destroyed by methods of subterfuge and indirection. The Post Office Department should not be used as a smoke screen or a stalking horse and forced to incur large so-called postal deficits in order to build up a merchant marine, especially so in the face of figures presented by Mr. LA GUARDIA and in face of the statements of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. WOOD] in the hearings showing that this money has largely not resulted in building ships but rather to confer favors on certain "pets." It is true this may not be a vice of the law but of its administration. We have plenty of money for ships, but we should not spend any more for "petting parties." Let us quit petting these plundering profiteers at public expense.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I got?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNELL). Thirty-three minutes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, the proposed bill amending section 407 of the Jones-White Act now before the House is the most imprudent, unbusinesslike, unfair, and sectional piece of legislation that has ever been foisted on the floor of this House in the past 20 years.

The gentleman from Maine [Mr. WHITE] was perfectly frank. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ABERNETHY] was also frank in what he said about the bill. They both appealed for support on the ground that the bill is directed against New York ship operators. Then the gentleman from Maine comes over here—on the Democratic side—and makes an appeal for the Mississippi Shipping Co. When he is asked a pertinent question by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DAVENPORT], he says, "Let the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH] answer that, because he has a better 'poker face' than I have." [Laughter.]

Let me read section 407, which this bill amends. I read:

Each contract for the carrying of ocean mail under this title shall be awarded to the lowest bidder who in the judgment of the Postmaster General possesses such qualifications as will insure the proper performance of the mail service under the contract.

That is the approved way for the Government of the United States to do business. It may not necessarily be the lowest bidder. It gives sufficient discretion in the hands of the Postmaster General.

Now, gentlemen, why this discrimination against the port of New York, with 150 years of shipping tradition back of it, and men who were engaged in the shipping business before you had a United States Shipping Board or a Government subsidy? I do not raise the sectional issue. That was raised in an appeal for support of the bill by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ABERNETHY], and others.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I have only five minutes. I am glad that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] is in the chair at this time. I am going to ask for a roll call on this bill. I am going to ask for a roll call on Monday, as I intend to call for the engrossed bill. I am going to give men who are interested in establishing an American merchant marine time to think the matter over during the week end and to get all the information concerning the operation and administration of the law granting these subsidies, subventions, or whatever you care to call them.

If you do not make an issue of it in New York, Mr. SNELL, I will.

The proponents point out the disadvantage this bill will bring to New York companies.

Why, did you ever hear of anything so sectional? Did you ever hear of anything so biased? We have here the great champion of eastern shipping [Mr. LEHLBACH] acting as the "yes man" for the gentleman from Maine [Mr. WHITE].

The Munson Line, in the shipping business for years, was making a bid. Then a mushroom company, the Mississippi Shipping Co., bidding low, and in order to give the mail contract to the Mississippi Co. the law must be amended. Then the France Line and the Diamond Line, all waiting to have this bill passed in order to buy the steamers they are now operating for a shoe string and receive juicy mail contracts for mail they will not carry.

Then the gentleman from Maine said—but, of course, he was not serious about it—that we have to insure the carrying of the mail. Gentlemen, the lines I mentioned yesterday, lines getting millions of dollars of subsidy, do not carry mail. The line mentioned by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], the Tacoma-Oriental, does not carry mail but receives mail subsidy.

Why, this is worse than legislative larceny. You are not building up an American merchant marine. You are building up sectional parasites who are going into the shipping business with no danger of any loss. There will not be any danger of any loss because they will get these subsidies, and then they will dump the steamers back to the Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. And then if a bona fide shipper, who has invested 100 per cent of capital in a line, wants to bid on it he has not the opportunity of bidding because under this bill absolute preference must be given to the parasites who come in and get their ships for nothing and the mail contract must be awarded to them, even though they may not have sufficiently fast ships to carry mail.

Gentlemen, we will have a vote on this Monday. I gave you the information yesterday, and I repeat it now. Read the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations; get the figures mentioned by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT] and the data given by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DAVENPORT], and then let your conscience be your guide. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH].

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, my district lies in part within the limits of the port of New York. One arm of New York Bay runs through the Kill von Kull into Newark Bay and it is an essential and integral part of the port of New York. Nobody is more solicitous about building it up than I am. I can not understand how on earth the gentleman from New York, who has just taken his seat, believes it could affect the port of New York in any way if the condition I am about to outline should obtain. Here is a steamship line established by the Government as an essential service running from the port of New Orleans to the eastern coast of South America. That line for a decade has been nurtured by the Government and operated for the Government by a local steamship concern that has the backing and support of the community in the hinterland that feeds its commodities through that port into the line. Eventually that operator, with the backing of the people who ship through that port, develops sufficient strength to operate it and own it for himself and he purchases it from the Government. That is all provided for in the act of 1920, and he has a preference, and rightly so, in purchasing that line rather than anyone else, because it was a part of the contract under which he operated that line for the Government that if he could and wanted to do so he should eventually have the opportunity of purchasing it and running it himself. Now, when that takes place, in order to strengthen these essential trade routes—and there are 38 of them—in 1928 we passed a law providing for these mail contracts, and it was intended that those who carried on the essential routes, from all the ports of the United States equally should be strengthened by having mail contracts, in order that they might successfully operate, in the first place, and that they might have resources with which to replace obsolescent ships with new and speedier ones.

Then, under such circumstances, the operator purchasing the line from New Orleans to the eastern coast of South America

makes a bid for that mail contract, which was intended for his aid, and a shipper from New York comes down to New Orleans and says, "I will carry the mail from New Orleans to the eastern coast of South America, although I have never sailed a boat out of New Orleans to that part of the world in my life before." We want to stop such unfair practices, which are not justifiable from any point of view whatsoever. How the stopping of such practices can have any effect on the port of New York—that is, stopping such practices with reference to a route from New Orleans to the eastern coast of South America—I can not understand. Nobody can understand it, and it only shows that the gentleman from New York does not know what he is talking about. [Applause.]

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. [Applause.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, while I have very much disagreed with some of the policies that have been written into legislation in the past with respect to the disposition of Government-owned vessels, and have disagreed with some policies with reference to their operation, I recognize that a general policy has been established with respect to that feature of our national affairs, and it is now the law of the land. In the main, with a few exceptions, I think it is a wise policy. I have given some investigation to the bill now pending before the House, and it seems to me that its provisions are entirely in conformity with the general policies of the existing law, that law seeking to build up and permanently maintain an adequate American merchant marine.

I can not understand how the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] has drawn the inferences he seems to have drawn, that this is a sectional bill or that it is an improvident bill with reference to the general policy of carrying out the existing law. I am somewhat in sympathy with the present occupant of the chair and his other colleagues from New York on account of the fact that the gentleman from New York has breathed considerable defiance against them this afternoon and says he proposes to make this an issue in New York, if they do not. I do not know that that frightens the gentlemen he has made threats against so much, because, as I recall, the gentleman from New York made other threats in an election in New York not very long ago, but did not seem to get very far.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Why bring that up? [Laughter.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. Now, seriously, gentlemen, the purposes of this bill have been very logically and very fairly stated by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. WHITE]. The purpose of it is not to add any extraordinary burden to the operations of the Post Office Department, because this bill limits these contracts to the maximum already fixed by law for carrying the mail. It provides that these contracts shall not be let to the lines operating out of these local communities unless they conform with the specifications laid down by the Postmaster General under existing law.

The amendment proposed provides that it shall not be effective unless the Shipping Board itself, which is the directing head of our merchant marine operations, shall certify that it conforms in their judgment along the general lines of policy in building up and maintaining an adequate merchant marine; and it provides that the maximum shall not be exceeded in the amount of these contracts.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Very well; I only have five minutes, but I will yield for a brief question.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. What is the serious objection to competitive bidding with the discretion that the law now provides?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think the gentleman from Maine has very fairly covered that subject. Take, for instance, this Mississippi Shipping Co.—if that is the correct name—that has been brought into the discussion. The Shipping Board invited operators to buy their ships. They were embarked upon the policy of building up adequate shipping lines from all the ports of the country, and I want the gentleman from New York to have his attention called to the provisions of section 402 of the existing act along the lines of a declaration of national policy on this question. It provides:

REQUIREMENTS OF POSTAL SERVICE

SEC. 402. As soon as practicable after the enactment of this act, and from time to time thereafter, it shall be the duty of the Postmaster General to certify to the United States Shipping Board what ocean mail routes, in his opinion, should be established and/or operated for the carrying of mails of the United States between ports (exclusive of ports in the Dominion of Canada other than ports in Nova Scotia) between which it is lawful under the navigation laws for a vessel not documented under the laws of the United States to carry merchandise, dis-

tributed so as equitably to serve the Atlantic, Mexican Gulf, and Pacific coast ports, the volume of mail then moving over such routes and the estimated volume thereof during the next five years, the times deemed by him advisable for the departure of the vessels carrying such mails, and other requirements necessary to provide an adequate postal service between such ports.

Now, the Mississippi Shipping Co. case is absolutely in line with this policy in that the operation shall not be sectional, but that it shall be equitable for all sections of our coast.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will the gentleman permit me to make one statement?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Let me conclude my thought.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I did not raise the sectional question; that was raised by the proponents.

Mr. BANKHEAD (continuing). In that case, here was a concern that at the invitation of the Government, and with the backing of its communities, not only its immediate community but that whole Mississippi Valley section, was anxious to have—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I shall not use this time in further argument on this bill, because, really, when I rose I had another object in mind of a rather personal nature that I hope the House will indulge me in for just a moment.

As a general proposition I do not indulge in panegyrics upon the floor of the House, and if the gentleman whom I am about to mention lived in a State where he had formidable Democratic opposition in elections, possibly, I should restrain myself from saying what I am about to say about him.

I came to the Sixty-fifth Congress at the same time as did the distinguished chairman of this committee, the Hon. WALLACE WHITE, of Maine. I served upon the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries with him for a number of years, and I desire to take the opportunity to state that I have never known a man on either side of the House who gave to the discharge of his committee duties a more careful, logical, and considerate investigation than did Mr. WHITE in all of the important matters affecting our merchant marine, the radio development of the country, and the other important matters of legislation that came before that committee. [Applause.]

He has announced that it is his intention at the conclusion of his present term in the House not to offer for reelection to this body, and I am sure, gentlemen, that I am expressing the universal attitude of all Members of this House, upon both sides of the aisle, in saying that we are losing from this membership at the expiration of his term one of the most useful and capable men that has served in this Congress, certainly since the Sixty-fifth Congress. [Applause.]

I do not desire to say anything in disparagement of the distinguished citizens of Maine who may aspire to the United States Senate in the forthcoming election. They are doubtless men of character and of courage and of ability, but I do have the temerity to say that if the people of the great State of Maine have reached the same conclusions that his associates upon the floor of the House of Representatives have reached with reference to the high intellect, to the splendid character, and to the very able legislative service he has rendered in the House of Representatives, I feel I may make the prophecy that there lies before the gentleman from Maine still more extended and, possibly, more useful service in another branch of our Government. [Applause.]

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I make the point of order that there is not a quorum present, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 12]

Aldrich	Britten	Chase	Domnick
Auf der Helde	Browne	Clarke, N. Y.	Doutrich
Bacon	Brunner	Collins	Doyle
Beck	Buchanan	Cooper, Ohio	Drewry
Black	Buckbee	Cramton	Elliott
Bolton	Busby	Crowther	Ellis
Boylan	Byrns	Culkin	Fitzgerald
Brand, Ga.	Carley	Cullen	Frear
Brand, Ohio	Carter, Wyo.	Curry	Free
Brigham	Celler	Dickstein	Freeman

Fulmer
Gavagan
Graham
Granfield
Guyer
Halsey
Hartley
Haugen
Hope
Houston
Hudspeth
Hughes
Igoe
James
Johnson, Ill.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, S. Dak.
Johnson, Wash.

Kendall, Pa.
Kerr
Kiess
Kinzer
Kunz
Lampert
Lankford, Va.
Lindsay
McCormick, Ill.
McDuffie
McFadden
Manlove
Martin
Mead
Menges
Michaelson
Mooney
Moore, Va.

Nelson, Wis.
Norton
O'Connell, N. Y.
O'Connor, N. Y.
Oliver, N. Y.
Pou
Prall
Pritchard
Purnell
Quayle
Rainey, Henry T.
Ransley
Sanders, N. Y.
Simmons
Simms
Sirovich
Somers, N. Y.
Spearing

Stedman
Stobbs
Sullivan, N. Y.
Sullivan, Pa.
Taylor, Colo.
Treadway
Underwood
Vestal
Warren
Welch, Calif.
Welsh, Pa.
Wolfenden
Wood
Woodrum
Wurzbach
Zihlman

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNELL). Three hundred and nineteen Members have answered to their names, and a quorum is present.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] five minutes.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I am perhaps the only nonwebfooted member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. From my home to tidewater, whether salted or unsalted, is about 600 miles. It is rather unique for one on the plains to have much to do with merchant marine. I know nothing of irregularities or abuses of merchant marine administration, and, of course, shall not discuss that which is not at issue here. If I understand the real purpose of this legislation, beginning in 1920, supplemented and reinforced in 1928, it was not for the purpose of developing ports or favoring ports throughout the United States, but its primary purpose and the controlling object was to serve the communities which originate the real subject and object of shipping.

So it is not a bill to specially serve the port of New York, the port of New Orleans, the port of San Francisco, but under this legislation granting favors which have been discussed, it has been for the purpose of developing and serving the communities and those broad stretches of fields and mines whose products are expected to go through our seaports. Seaports are the mere means of passage to the great markets of the world.

When our friend from one of the New York districts levels an attack against the committee as he has all along, he seems to have become obsessed with the fact that it is a battle between other ports and the great port of New York, of which we are all so proud. But the favors to be granted under this bill specify the precise terms under which each contract will be granted. The Postmaster General is authorized, notwithstanding the act entitled "An act to provide for ocean mail service between the United States and foreign ports, and to promote commerce," approved March 3, 1891, to contract for the carrying of the mails over such lines at such price as may be agreed upon by the board and the Postmaster General:

Provided, That preference in the sale or assignment of vessels for operation on such steamship lines shall be given to persons who are citizens of the United States who have the support, financial and otherwise, of the domestic communities, primarily interested in such lines if the board is satisfied of the ability of such persons to maintain the service desired and proposed to be maintained or to persons who are citizens of the United States who may then be maintaining a service from the port of the United States to or in the general direction of the world market port to which the board has determined that such service should be established.

In the hearings, which have been quite voluminous, the most important fact developed so far as I was concerned is this: These matters are to be determined on the community interest. So that the great Northwest which furnishes ultimately the great shipping material that we need to have taken care of in times of peace, and especially in times of war, shall be a primary consideration.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLOAN. No; I will not; I think the gentleman has wasted his fair share of time in this discussion.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. You are not answering my argument.

Mr. SLOAN. I did not intend to answer it. The trouble with the gentleman is he makes the mistake that Tennyson speaks about when he says: "He mistakes the rumble of his burg for the murmur of the world."

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman is not discussing the bill but personalities.

Mr. SLOAN. The personalities arose on the gentleman's initiation and without recognition from the Chair. If the gentleman would give us a few rare exhibitions of silence in this House for short periods, bills would be discussed with more freedom and more profit.

The great Northwest is very much interested in this bill. Last year when our efficient and great President with his great will, but not an imperious one, saw it was necessary to get to tidewater with our grains prevailed upon the railroads to make an extraordinary low rate to tidewater, then the ships under American flags made the ocean rates which other lines follow. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER].

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, the policy that we have adopted touching our shipping and to which this legislation is supplementary is for the purpose of aiding our own people to take a part in the world trade. This applies especially to agriculture, which is the great product of the Middle West, and which we want to encourage and help take its true place in foreign trade.

We are agreed that the more of our agricultural products we can sell abroad the better it is for agriculture. The greater the market the greater the demand and the better the prices. One of the ills affecting agriculture is that more is being produced than can successfully be marketed at home. Therefore we must have for our surplus a foreign market. How can the farmer aid in creating a larger foreign market for his products? Will an American merchant marine help him do this? As to this I quote Dr. Julius Klein, the Assistant Secretary of Commerce and the former Chief of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. There is no better authority than Doctor Klein. He recently wrote me as follows:

The benefits which agriculture derives from our merchant marine are at once evident from the fact that about 30 per cent of our water-borne exports of farm products are carried by American ships.

This participation of American ships means the assurance to our farmers of more considerate treatment with respect to ocean freight rates. The fortunes of American shipowners necessarily are more dependent upon the welfare of our farmers than are the fortunes of foreign shipowners. Moreover, a sizeable merchant fleet under the American flag is a protection to our farmers against emergencies which divert foreign ships from our shores. This was demonstrated strikingly during the British coal strike of 1926, during which many foreign ships were diverted from the carrying of our grain, lumber, etc., to the carrying of coal to Great Britain. Had it not been for the substantial number of American ships available our farmers would have lost heavily through utter inability to move their crops.

Without a sizeable merchant marine under the American flag our export trade would be subject to the expediences of foreign ships, an extremely hazardous situation inasmuch as our water-borne foreign trade reaches the stupendous total of seven and three-quarter billion dollars.

The farmer is 1 in 4 of our population. Of our exportable surplus one-half consists of agriculture.

Need for our ships has been made evident a number of times. In 1926 we were unable to get grain to the markets of the world. The Shipping Board was appealed to and 27 grain-carrying ships were assigned by the Shipping Board to this task. Thirty-two others were put in condition for assisting in this huge task. Had the Shipping Board not been able to do this it would have been disastrous to the farmer; whereas this enhanced the price of grain to between \$600,000,000 and \$800,000,000. This instance alone—and I could cite others—warrants the creating of a merchant marine. Ocean transportation for the farmer is as important as other methods of transportation at home, such as the road passing the farm, the railroad train, the track, and inland waterways. The farmers must deliver their products to the competitive markets whether they be at home or abroad. The best way for our farmers to deliver their products to the markets of the world is upon American ships and American supervision and contact.

Up to 1920 we were practically without American ships upon the high seas. We had to trust all to foreign ships, and usually to our disadvantage. In consequence of Shipping Board activities, the United States flag returned to the seas as a substantial factor in foreign commerce, and records of shipping progress from 1921 to 1929 afford opportunity for further consideration of the importance of the flag in the development of foreign trade.

In carrying out the provisions of the merchant marine act of 1920, which authorized the United States Shipping Board to

establish services in essential trade routes to all parts of the world, we were in competition with maritime nations having the knowledge and merchantism of a background of long-established and successful maritime services, and during the period of reestablishing ourselves on the seas the nations with whom we were competing had an additional advantage in modern seagoing ships.

In the decade ending 1914 the average carried in American ships was slightly more than 10 per cent of the total value of our foreign trade, while in the decade ending June 30, 1929, it averaged better than 36 per cent. In view of the fact that the value of our total water-borne foreign trade in the decade just concluded has been more than double that of the decade ending with 1914, it is significant that the 26 per cent gain in the percentage of our foreign trade carried in American ships involved an advance from an annual average of \$300,000,000 during the decade 1905 to 1914 to an annual average of \$2,600,000,000 in the decade 1920 to 1929, an increase during this period of more than 700 per cent in the value of our commerce carried in American ships.

Agriculture should work its best through its Government at Washington, to the end that we have a genuine merchant marine. When I say a merchant marine I mean one owned and operated by private capital. Government ownerships have been and are only for the purpose of demonstrating the value to the United States of foreign trade and that we can participate in it if we will. As soon as private capital will take over the overseas routes we have established we will sell the balance of our ships and leave it to private enterprise. That is being done now, and private capital is doing fairly well on some routes.

Our shippers in foreign trade must use the American ships we now have if they wish to encourage a real American merchant marine. Our shippers should not, where they can avoid it, use foreign ships. The fact, though, is that foreign ships during the last year carried two-thirds of our foreign trade. This does more harm to farm products than any other. As a result foreign trade in agricultural products has decreased, while manufactured products have greatly increased. Our exports for 1928-29 totaled \$5,374,000,000, and imports amounted to \$4,292,000,000, both items being an increase over the previous year. Foreign trade is good for the farmer, for labor, and capital.

We can not expect to continue our foreign trade and meet emergencies that arise in connection with it unless we have and maintain a merchant marine. The United States has pointed the way to world's trade and commerce. It is now up to private enterprise and the American spirit of keeping our flag upon the ocean. The Shipping Board has done well, but the time has about come now for the Government to go out of the shipping business. I cite you an example or so of the great good that Shipping Board vessels have done for American trade and showing the way for a privately owned merchant marine. Take South America.

A survey of our trade with South America furnishes illuminating information on the effect of the employment of American-flag vessels in the trade with that country. In 1914 only five United States flag vessels were in the service between the United States and ports in South America. One of these ships was a combination passenger and freight carrier. And the others were cargo carriers. The combined gross tonnage of the five vessels was 22,741 tons. No records are available as to the tonnage volume of our trade with South America in 1914, but the value of the imports was \$222,677,000, and of the exports \$124,540,000; a total trade of \$347,217,000.

In 1920 and succeeding years seven lines operating in South American trades were inaugurated by the United States Shipping Board. Forty-five vessels, aggregating 343,825 gross tons, were allocated by the board to these South American services. Privately owned American lines have also established South American services, and there are now 107 United States flag vessels of 645,000 gross tons employed in South American trade routes. This total includes 26 Shipping Board boats of 134,000 gross tons which are still engaged in South American trade.

What has been the effect of this influx of American-flag vessels tonnage?

The imports of 1921 were valued at \$295,623,000 and the exports at \$273,325,000, an increase of \$221,731,000, nearly 64 per cent over the value of the total trade of 1914. The earliest available cargo tonnage figures covered the year 1921, and it is noted that our water-borne commerce with South America in that year included imports of 2,217,226 tons and exports of 3,143,735 tons, a total trade of 5,360,961 cargo tons. The South American trade of 1928 was valued at more than \$1,000,000,000.

The years 1921 to 1928 constitute the period during which the activities of American-flag vessels were expanded in South

American trade, and the value of that trade in 1928 was more than 200 per cent greater than in 1914.

The development of foreign trade in the Orient further illustrates the influence of American-flag ships in the expansion of trade.

Prior to the World War the only American-flag vessels employed in trade with Asia were those of one line operating five vessels of 55,000 gross tons out of Pacific coast terminals. The average annual value of the foreign commerce of the United States with Asia during the 5-year period 1910 to 1914 was less than \$380,000,000 per year. Following the war seven lines were established by the Shipping Board to operate on routes to Asia. Three of these lines having terminals on the Atlantic coast operated 43 vessels of 314,300 gross tons and four lines operating from the Pacific coast employed 39 vessels of 313,230 gross tons, a total of 82 ships of 627,530 gross tons. The volume of trade with Asia in 1928 was more than \$1,800,000,000, an increase of nearly 380 per cent, and records of vessel employment indicate that 136 American-flag vessels of 1,000,000 gross tons are now employed in the oriental trade.

Similar developments are noted in records of trade with Africa.

Prior to the war there were no American-flag services to that continent, and the average annual trade during the 5-year period 1910 to 1914 was slightly more than \$47,000,000 per year. The Shipping Board inaugurated two lines, one to South and East Africa, the other to West African ports. Fifteen ships of 82,400 gross tons were assigned to these trades. The trade of the United States with Africa during 1928 was valued at nearly \$207,000,000, an increase above the 1910-1914 average of 340 per cent. There are now employed in African services 18 American-flag vessels of nearly 100,000 gross tons.

As a result of the increase in trade we can reach but one conclusion, that trade follows the flag; for in addition to the increase in the carriage of American commerce in American ships, it is obvious that the influx of American-flag services has contributed largely to the expansion of trade.

At the present time the ocean-going American merchant fleet in established lines in foreign and noncontiguous trades consists of 671 vessels of over 3,865,000 gross tons. This shows a 500 per cent increase in numbers and nearly 550 per cent in tonnage since 1914. With few exceptions these vessels are of 2,000 gross tons and over, and 60 per cent of the number and 65 per cent of the gross tonnage are now under private ownership.

From the foregoing statement it is evident that steady and material progress has been made by Uncle Sam in assisting American shipping to regain its position on the seas.

To what proportions the water-borne foreign commerce of the United States has grown can best be appreciated by stating that, during the year 1928, 5,100 vessels of 23,000,000 gross tons, flying the flags of 28 countries, transported 1,750,000 passengers and 100,000,000 tons of cargo, valued at \$8,000,000,000, passing through 1,600 American and foreign ports. The combined passenger and freight revenues approximated \$1,000,000,000.

Is this business worth going after?

Millions of families are dependent for their livelihood on the 10 per cent excess production over our own needs for which foreign markets must be found.

It is therefore essential that these industries are employed to their capacity to provide maximum employment. There must be no weak link between production and markets.

Transportation plays a vital part in successful foreign trading, and any interruption in the normal flow of our commerce causes fatal results.

To permit the greater portion of our commerce to be carried in foreign-flag ships, because it can be carried cheaper, has proven conclusively to be an economic fallacy. The American people apparently realize this and are determined that the carriage of the greater portion of their commerce must always be controlled by their own ships.

A factor which can not be overlooked, and which is recognized in all business to-day, is the element of personal contact. What better medium is there than the ships and the personnel of the ships to establish this contact? No nation can or will perform this service for another.

The American people have benefited from the lessons of the past. They have rallied to the cause of American shipping once more. They are solidly behind the movement for the permanent establishment of an adequate merchant marine, realizing that not only their prosperity and security depend largely on their ships of commerce, but that the destiny of these United States is inseparable from the sea.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for eight minutes.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I wish, first, to heartily indorse the tribute paid by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. For 10 or 11 years I have had the privilege of serving upon the same committee with the distinguished gentleman from Maine, thereby coming in close personal and official contact with him. I say without hesitation that I have never known a more thorough gentleman in every sense of the word or a more conscientious and faithful public servant; and while he and I have not always been in accord upon the measures considered by our committee, yet I have never for a moment at any time, in my mind or otherwise, questioned his integrity of purpose or his full patriotism. [Applause.] As suggested by the gentleman from Alabama, the House of Representatives will suffer a distinct loss in the departure from it of the gentleman from Maine, and we can only be consoled by the fact that we trust he may be elevated to still higher and more deserved honors. [Applause.]

Mr. DYER. The gentleman from Tennessee evidently forgets that the gentleman from Maine is a candidate for the Senate when the gentleman speaks of his being elevated to higher honors. [Laughter.]

Mr. DAVIS. I stand corrected on that feature of it. However, as it is his ambition to change his position, of course we wish him Godspeed.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to comment very briefly upon the bill under consideration. Of course, in the few minutes that I have it is impossible for me to enter into any detailed discussion of it. The bill embraces in its consideration the very wide and important subject of an American merchant marine. This bill comes to the House with the unanimous indorsement of the members of the committee. We believe that it will go far toward effectuating the purpose of the merchant marine act of 1920 and the merchant marine act of 1928 to establish and maintain a real American merchant marine, equitably distributed among all sections of the country—the Atlantic, the Gulf, and the Pacific coasts.

The purpose of the legislation is that there shall be established and maintained essential services operating to and from all important American ports wherever situated to and from all important foreign ports. As I stated, this bill is designed to effectuate that purpose. It is designed to prevent a very few companies from monopolizing the American services, not only in one section of the country but in more than one, or perhaps in all sections of the country. We do not think that would be a healthy situation. As proposed in the pending bill, as explained by members of the committee who have already spoken, we believe that the best, the most useful, the most effective, the most permanent American merchant marine can be established and maintained only when the different services have the support, financial and otherwise, of the various ports of the country from which they operate, together with the support of the hinterland from which the cargo flows naturally and most economically to those ports.

The merchant marine act, 1920, directed the establishment and maintenance of adequate shipping services from all of our principal ports in all sections of the country. The merchant marine act, 1928, reaffirmed this policy. As before stated, this act also directed the Attorney General to certify to the Shipping Board what ocean mail routes, in his opinion, should be established and/or operated for the carrying of mails of the United States—

distributed so as equitably to serve the Atlantic, Mexican Gulf, and Pacific coast ports.

As shown by official figures, which I shall insert in the RECORD, 32 per cent of our export tonnage goes out of the Gulf and 24.5 per cent of both our export and import tonnage goes in and out of the Gulf. The export tonnage of all southern ports is greater than that of the North Atlantic or the Pacific coast; the import tonnage through all southern ports is second to that of the North Atlantic and several times larger than that of the Pacific.

And yet under the ocean mail contracts now in force the North Atlantic is receiving \$6,720,144, Pacific ports receiving \$5,788,512, Gulf ports receiving \$295,665, and south Atlantic ports receiving \$367,567. In other words, while 24.5 per cent of our commerce is moving through Gulf ports, yet Gulf lines are only receiving one forty-fourth of the mail contract pay.

The awards under the mail contracts now under advertisement will make but little change in these ratios.

We think that ample safeguards are provided in this bill to guard against the apprehensions that have been expressed by some of the members of the committee.

Many wild and inaccurate statements have been made by some members, which I have not time to discuss. While it is doubtless true, as I have already conceded, that some mistakes have been made in the administration of the law and that some things have been done which, as I said yesterday, I do not indorse and which I shall not defend, yet we sincerely trust that similar mistakes will not occur in the future, and we believe that the bills that were passed yesterday and this bill will prevent a recurrence of some of the things that have happened and that have been justly subject to criticism.

Now, with respect to these mail contracts, 25 contracts have been awarded; and while it is true that new shipping construction was required in but seven of those contracts, on the other hand it is true that about 10 of the other contractors were required to make substitutions or improve and recondition some of their ships.

I shall insert in the RECORD a table showing the contracts which have been awarded, service required, vessels to be built, substitutions and betterments, and so forth.

I shall insert a table giving similar information in regard to the mail contracts now under advertisement.

The award of some of these contracts is prohibited by the terms of the bill, H. R. 8361, unanimously passed by the House yesterday.

The bills reported by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries passed by the House yesterday and the one now under consideration are in the interest of fairness and a real American merchant marine, designed to serve all sections of the country. [Applause.]

Under leave granted, I herewith insert the data and tables referred to in my speech, as follows:

List of mail contracts under Jones-White Act in effect December 1, 1929, and amounts of pay estimated by Post Office Department for fiscal year 1931

From North Atlantic ports:		
Funson Steamship Line	\$1,247,584	
Export Steamship Co.	1,630,161	
American South African Line	285,522	
Grace Steamship Co.	793,920	
Eastern Steamship Co.	225,624	
New York & Porto Rico Steamship Co.	46,176	
American Scantic Line	583,700	
American West African Line	286,650	
Atlantic & Caribbean Co.	372,419	
New York & Cuba Mail Co. (Habana)	410,356	
New York & Cuba Mail Co. (Vera Cruz)	419,536	
American Line (Bahoa)	418,496	
		\$6,720,144
From Pacific ports:		
Oceanic Steamship Co.	692,886	
Dollar Line (Manila)	1,262,664	
Dollar Line (Colombo)	1,141,296	
Admiral Oriental Line	1,070,784	
States Steamship Co. (Manila)	399,540	
States Steamship Co. (Dalren)	184,440	
Oceanic-Oriental Co. (Auckland)	169,740	
Oceanic-Oriental Co. (Melbourne)	210,960	
Pacific Argentine Brazil Line	308,523	
Tac. Oriental Co.	347,679	
		5,788,512
From Gulf ports:		
Gulf Mail Steamship Co.	26,618	
Lykes Steamship Co.	269,047	
		295,665
From South Atlantic ports:		
South Atlantic Steamship Co.		367,567
Total		13,171,978

The following is the approximate first-year cost of service and names of prospective bidders on 18 merchant marine routes recently certified for mail contracts, 12 of which are under advertisement, 4 awaiting advertisement, and 2 to be covered by extension of present contracts:

NORTH ATLANTIC

Under advertisement:		
New York to Puerto Colombia—Colombian Steamship Co.	\$268,450	
New York to Port Limon—United Fruit Co.	247,624	
New York to Southampton—United States Lines	654,636	
New York to Hamburg—United States Lines	1,314,708	
New York to Plymouth—United States Lines	630,864	
Baltimore to Hamburg—Roosevelt Steamship Co.	1,243,320	
Extension of present contract:		
New York to Batoum—Export Steamship Corporation	536,940	
New York to Valparaiso—Grace Line	516,048	
		5,412,590

PACIFIC

Under advertisement:		
San Francisco to Puerto Colombia—Grace Line	392,184	
Tacoma to Valparaiso—Grace Line	284,920	
San Francisco to Puerto Armuellas—United Fruit Co.	393,770	
		1,070,874

Soon to be advertised:		
Los Angeles to North China—Oceanic and Oriental Steamship Co.		
Los Angeles to Sargon—Oceanic and Oriental Steamship Co.		
San Francisco to Manila—Matson Line.		

GULF OF MEXICO

Under advertisement:

New Orleans to Bahia Blanca (east coast South America)—Gulf Brazil River Plate.....	\$575,940
New Orleans to Puerto Colombia—United Fruit Co.....	253,760
New Orleans to Spanish and Portuguese ports—Gulf West Mediterranean Line.....	397,120

1,226,820

Soon to be advertised: Gulf to West Africa—Barber Steamship Co.

Volume of imports and exports, by States and geographic divisions, fiscal year ending June 30, 1929¹

State and geographic division	Imports		Exports	
	Tons	Rank	Tons	Rank
Maine.....	603,702	11	122,614	21
Massachusetts.....	3,360,585	5	382,863	16
New Hampshire.....	16,410	26	143	27
Rhode Island.....	384,422	18	493	26
Connecticut.....	50,554	24		
Vermont.....	642	29		
New England States.....	4,416,315	3	506,113	5
New York.....	22,012,314	1	14,796,189	1
New Jersey.....	681	28	12,836	24
Pennsylvania.....	4,331,665	4	1,910,242	9
Delaware.....	535,502	14	6,140	25
Middle Atlantic States.....	26,878,162	1	16,725,407	2
Maryland.....	4,750,556	3	1,606,424	12
Virginia.....	583,837	12	2,481,102	7
North Carolina.....	218,020	20	24,338	23
South Carolina.....	464,315	15	163,002	20
Georgia.....	458,703	16	287,614	17
Florida.....	744,072	10	1,650,550	11
Alabama.....	404,686	17	604,953	14
Mississippi.....	43,298	25	273,890	18
Louisiana.....	5,000,239	2	5,378,650	5
Texas.....	1,060,686	8	7,580,620	3
Southern States.....	13,731,412	2	20,051,143	1

¹ Preliminary figures compiled from statistics issued by the Division of Statistics, Bureau of Research, U. S. Shipping Board.

Volume of imports and exports, by States and geographic divisions, fiscal year ending June 30, 1929—Continued

State and geographic division	Imports		Exports	
	Tons	Rank	Tons	Rank
Ohio.....	572,642	13	5,455,264	4
Indiana.....	3,286	27	56,730	22
Illinois.....	206,145	19	174,803	19
Wisconsin.....	145,428	21	1,741,209	10
Minnesota.....	69,859	23	584,013	15
Michigan.....	803,344	9	831,945	13
Middle Western States.....	1,863,702	5	8,843,964	4
California.....	1,866,882	6	8,662,253	2
Oregon.....	111,303	22	1,928,132	8
Washington.....	1,134,197	7	2,886,402	6
Pacific States.....	3,112,382	4	13,476,787	3
Total United States.....	50,001,973		59,603,414	

Water-borne foreign commerce of the United States, by coastal districts, excluding Great Lakes, calendar year 1928

(In cargo tons of 2,240 pounds)

District	Imports	Exports	Combined commerce
North Atlantic (from Norfolk north).....	29,309,389	17,710,667	47,020,056
South Atlantic.....	1,614,994	706,992	2,321,986
Gulf.....	6,324,704	15,025,084	21,349,788
Pacific.....	3,027,057	13,440,643	16,467,700
Total.....	40,276,144	46,883,386	87,159,530

CONSTRUCTION PROPOSALS FOR PRESENT ROUTES

The following table outlines construction and betterment requirements for the 25 ocean mail routes already in operation. The data shows the port of departure and destination of the various services, and lists new ships to be added, totaling 17, and substitutions and betterments, totaling 22.

Table No. 1

Route No.	Ocean mail route and contractor	Service required		Vessels to be built		Total gross tonnage	Dates of completion	Estimated cost of each ship	Estimated total cost	Substitutions and betterments	
		Trips per annum	Outward voyage	Number	Speed					Number	Speed
4	New York to Buenos Aires, Munson Steamship Co.....	26	Days 18		Knots						Knots
5	Export Steamship Corporation:										
	(a) New York to Tunis.....	12	25								
	(b) New York to Naples.....	24	25								
	(c) New York to Beirut.....	24	30	4	14	34,000	1930 1931 1932 1933	\$2,200,000	\$8,800,000		
	(d) New York to Constanza.....	36	30								
6	New York to Beira, American South African Line.....	12	38	2	14	17,000	1930 1931	1,800,000	3,600,000		
8	New York to Valparaiso, Grace Steamship Co.....	26	18	2	18	16,000	1930 1931	3,273,000	6,546,000		
10	San Juan to Santo Domingo, New York & Porto Rico Steamship Co. ¹	52	1								
15	Boston to Yarmouth, Eastern Steamship Line.....	118	1								
16	New York to Helsingfors, American Seacole Line.....	36-52	22							8	12
17	New York to West Africa, American West African Line.....	20	36							3	14
18	New York to Maracaibo, Atlantic & Caribbean Steam Navigation Co. "Red D".....	52	12							1	13
20	New York to Habana, New York & Cuba Mail Line.....	52	4	2	18	22,600	1930 1931	4,350,000	8,700,000		
21	New York to Progreso, New York & Cuba Mail Line.....	52	9							1	15
22	New Orleans to Progreso, Gulf Mail Steamship Co.....	36	3							1	13
23	Galveston and Port Arthur to Santo Domingo City, Lykes Bros. Steamship Co.....	52	10							1	13
24	San Francisco to Sydney Oceanic Steamship Co.....	17	21	2	20	37,000	1931 1932	7,800,000	15,600,000		
25	San Francisco to Manila, Dollar Steamship Co. ⁴	26	28								
26	Seattle to Manila, Admiral Oriental Line ⁴	26	24								
27	San Francisco to Colombo, Dollar Steamship Co. ⁴	26	48	4	20	84,000	1931 1933 1935 1937	7,050,000	28,200,000		
28	Portland to Manila, States Steamship Co.....	24	33							2	14
29	Portland to Dairen, States Steamship Co.....	12	30							1	14
30	Los Angeles to Auckland, Oceanic & Oriental Navigation Co.....	12	26							(9)	(9)
31	Los Angeles to Melbourne, Oceanic & Oriental Navigation Co.....	12	32							(9)	(9)

¹ Contract for 3 years 11 months expires June 30, 1932.
² Recondition and increased speed.
³ Already accomplished.

⁴ Routes 25, 26, and 27 combined for building program.
⁵ By agreement.

Table No. 1—Continued

Route No.	Ocean mail route and contractor	Service required		Vessels to be built		Total gross tonnage	Dates of completion	Estimated cost of each ship	Estimated total cost	Substitutions and betterments	
		Trips per annum	Outward voyage	Number	Speed					Number	Speed
32	New York to Balboa, American Line Steamship Corporation	26	Days 7	1	Knots 18	20,500	1929	\$7,000,000	\$7,000,000		Knots
33	Savannah to Liverpool and Bremen, South Atlantic Steamship Co.	36	20-22							3	12
34	San Francisco to Bahia Blanca, Pacific-Argentine-Brazil Line ⁴	12	40							(9)	(3)
36	Tacoma to Manila, Tacoma Oriental Steamship Co.	12	33							1	13
	Tacoma to Dairen, Tacoma Oriental Steamship Co.	12	30								
	Total			17		231,100			78,446,000	22	

⁴ By agreement.⁹ Reconditioned—passenger and refrigeration.

CONSTRUCTION PROPOSALS FOR NEW ROUTES

The following table, a tentative outline of construction required for 12 new ocean mail routes (January 18, 1930), prepared by A. Lane Cricher, Chief of the Transportation Division of the Department of Commerce, sets forth the requirements, bids for which are being advertised by the Post Office Department.

To illustrate, the table, route No. 39, San Francisco to Puerto Armuellas, provides for 52 trips from San Francisco, each voyage taking 10 days from port of departure to destination. This route requires the

construction of three vessels with a speed of 16 knots per hour and a gross tonnage of 15,000. The route would be ready for operation by 1933, which is the date of completion for the stipulated vessels whose estimated cost is \$9,600,000.

The name of prospective bidders listed directly beneath the name of the proposed ocean mail route denotes the particular company or companies which have urged the advertisement of the contract for the service; this does not mean that the company listed will receive the contract, the division points out.

Table No. 2

Route No.	Proposed ocean mail route prospective bidder	Service required		Vessels to be built		Total gross tonnage	Dates of completion	Estimated	
		Trips per annum	Outward voyage	Number	Speed			Cost of each ship	Total cost
			Days		Knots				
19	New York to Puerto Colombia, Colombian Steamship Co.	52	5	3	16	15,000	1933 1934 1935	\$2,500,000	\$7,500,000
35	New Orleans to Bahia Blanca, Gulf Brazil River Plate	36-52	18	4 2	13 13-16	20,000 16,000	1932 1937	1,500,000 3,000,000	6,000,000 6,000,000
37	San Francisco to Puerto Colombia, Grace Line	26	23	2	18	16,000	1933 1934	3,500,000	7,000,000
38	Tacoma to Valparaiso, Grace Line	17	35	1	18	8,000	1933	3,500,000	3,500,000
39	San Francisco to Puerto Armuellas, United Fruit Co.	52	10	3	16	15,000	1933	3,200,000	9,600,000
40	New York to Limon, United Fruit Co.	52	5	3	16	22,500	1934	4,500,000	13,500,000
41	New Orleans to Puerto Colombia, United Fruit Co.	52	5	2	16	10,000	1936	3,200,000	6,400,000
42	New York to Southampton, United States Lines ¹	16-52	5	2	28	90,000	1935	30,000,000	60,000,000
43	New York to Hamburg, United States Lines	52	7	2	20	40,000	1935	10,000,000	20,000,000
44	New York to London, United States Lines ²	52	9	2	18	14,000	1936	3,500,000	7,000,000
45	New Orleans to West Mediterranean ports, Gulf West Mediterranean Line	32	18	2	15	10,000	1939	1,500,000	3,000,000
46	Baltimore to Hamburg, Roosevelt Steamship Co.	52	12	2 2	16 18	35,000 16,000	1932 1936	1,200,000 3,500,000	6,000,000 7,000,000
	Total			35		327,500			162,500,000
	Increased service to be granted under old contract:								
5	New York to Batoum, Export Steamship Corporation ⁴	36	20	4	14	34,000	1936 1937	2,200,000	8,800,000
8	New York to Valparaiso, Grace Line ⁴	26	18	1	18	8,000	1933	3,500,000	3,500,000
	Grand total			40		369,500			174,800,000

¹ 1 additional vessel of 45,000 tons will be required within 3 years if some one other than the United States Lines is successful bidder. Otherwise Leviathan will correspond to this vessel.

² Contract is for 5 years. Extension for additional 5 years, conditional on substitution of 2 ships.

³ Reconstructed vessels.

⁴ Extension of present contract route No. 5.

⁵ Extension of present contract route No. 8.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the pending amendment.

The previous question was ordered.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the engrossed bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York asks for the engrossed bill.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Does the engrossed bill, printed by machinery, contain the amendment adopted a minute ago?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is informed it does.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is pretty quick work, but I will take the Speaker's word for it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I call for a division.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York demands a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 180, noes 27.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground of no quorum.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The Chair has already counted.

Mr. TILSON. No; Mr. Speaker, the Chair must count.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (after counting). Two hundred and twenty-seven Members are present—a quorum.

So the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. LEHLBACH, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 60 seconds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to proceed for 60 seconds. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of having the engrossed copy of the bill here and read was not to avoid a record vote but was to dispose of the bill to-day, which happens to be the last day during this session of Congress at which the distinguished chairman of the committee is going to be present. We wanted to pass his bill in his presence and with his assistance. As to having a record vote, the gentleman from New York, after the division, could have asked for the yeas and nays, but he did not do so. [Applause.]

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have about three minutes of time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think it is contrary to the rules of the House and to the proper conduct of the House for Members to take the floor purely for the purpose of criticizing each other. Now, if the gentleman intends to do that, I shall have to object.

Mr. SLOAN. My criticism, Mr. Speaker, has all been very favorable, because the only question was the matter of the distinguished gentleman's excessive diligence. The gentleman from New York, in opposing these several bills, summoned all of his logic and all of his eloquence on three of them. The result was that the adverse vote was the vote of the entire delegation from the twentieth district of New York against one of them, and all the rest present for the three bills. [Applause.]

The regular order was demanded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The regular order is: Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that during the debates on these four several measures the gentleman from New York, I think the RECORD will show, either by grant of time or by interjection, spoke a dozen times. The time had almost elapsed, and I, as a member of the committee, representing the interior of this country as best I can, had but five minutes remaining. I thought that perhaps the gentleman from New York, in the fullness of his time, might well have not injected his personality or have pursued his habit, which is becoming with him, apparently, almost a disease, of breaking in wherever there is a gap, or he can make one. I want to tell the gentleman—

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLOAN. Yes. I yield to this "Dyer" necessity that seems to present itself. [Laughter.]

Mr. DYER. As I understand the proceedings, when the gentleman from Nebraska had the floor before, the gentleman from New York asked if he would yield. The gentleman declined to yield, and immediately began a criticism of the gentleman from New York. I think the gentleman from Nebraska—being the distinguished lawyer he is and having rendered splendid service in the House—knows it is not apt to help the discipline of the House by doing that sort of thing.

Mr. SLOAN. If the gentleman from Missouri will sharpen up his memory and suppress his "forgetter" he will remember that when I refused to yield the gentleman from New York did not desist in his importunities nor cease his unrecognized interruptions. I think it is a proper criticism to suggest the idea of flavoring some of his procedure with a little essence of silence rather than persistently breaking in and taking men's time, who have studied the question at length and whose time is limited and no opportunity for additional time. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Nebraska rise?

Mr. HOWARD. I want to talk for two minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes?

Mr. HOWARD. That is it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I am one Nebraskan who voted for this bill, and one who is not ashamed of it, and yet I want to make the most earnest protest I know how to make against the manner of procedure leading up to the final passage of the bill.

I do not like gag rules of any kind [applause] and the idea of bringing in an engrossed copy of the bill for third reading here, containing amendments which were not adopted until after the engrossed bill was written—that is a little bit too raw for a fellow who comes from the prairie country to call righteous. [Laughter and applause.]

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table, and under the rule referred as follows:

S. 3421. An act to authorize the Tidewater Toll Properties (Inc.), its legal representatives and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Choptank River at a point at or near Cambridge, Md.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, March 3, 1930, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Monday, March 3, 1930, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

(10.30 a. m.)

Relating to the carriage of goods by sea (H. R. 3830).

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(1.30 p. m.)

Navy Department appropriation bill.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

353. Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation pertaining to the legislative establishment under the Public Printer for the fiscal year 1931, amounting to \$2,100 (H. Doc. No. 306), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. ARENTZ: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 5057. A bill to provide for the construction of a gravel road in the Walker River Indian Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 802). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1601. A bill to authorize the Department of Agriculture to issue two duplicate checks in favor of Utah State treasurer where the originals have been lost; without amendment (Rept. No. 807). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. BUTLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 573. A bill for the relief of Barzilla William Bramble; without amendment (Rept. No. 803). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 764. A bill for the relief of Thelma Phelps Lester; without amendment (Rept. No. 804). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2876. A bill for the relief of J. C. Peixotto; without amendment (Rept. No. 805). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BRITTEN: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 9109. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the Jefferson Memorial Association of St. Louis, Mo., the ship's bell, plaque, war record, name plate,

and silver service of the cruiser *St. Louis* that is now or may be in his custody; with amendment (Rept. No. 806). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKBEE: A bill (H. R. 10415) to amend section 79 of the Judicial Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 10416) to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HARE: A bill (H. R. 10417) for the relief of the State of South Carolina for damage to and destruction of roads and bridges by flood in 1929; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. McDUFFIE: A bill (H. R. 10418) to amend the interstate commerce act, as amended, to require separate valuation of terminal facilities, and a reasonable return thereon; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 10419) to authorize the erection of an addition to the existing Veterans' Bureau hospital at Bedford, Mass., and to authorize the appropriation therefor; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. SPARKS: A bill (H. R. 10420) to make "Behold the Flag" the national tribute to the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 10421) to authorize reduction of sentences in certain cases in Federal courts after the expiration of the term of court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLTON: A bill (H. R. 10422) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make exchanges of certain lands in connection with the creation of wild-life reservations to be administered by the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 10423) to repeal the national motor vehicle theft act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 10424) to provide for investigations and experiments in preserving and shipping watermelons, cantaloupes, fruits, vegetables, and other truck crops, through cold storage, by the Secretary of Agriculture, for use in domestic and foreign trade, and for securing new and better markets therefor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LEAVITT: A bill (H. R. 10425) to amend the act of June 6, 1912 (37 Stat. L. 125; U. S. C., title 25, sec. 425), entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to classify and appraise unallotted Indian lands"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BEERS: A resolution (H. Res. 174) providing for the printing of the proceedings of the forty-ninth annual encampment of the commandery in chief, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 10426) granting a pension to Adelia L. Zwickel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 10427) for the relief of Ancona Printing Co. (Inc.); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 10428) for the relief of Edith Barber; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 10429) for the relief of Sadie Bermi; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EATON of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 10430) granting an increase of pension to Mary I. Shennard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALL of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 10431) for the relief of J. F. Amick; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOFFMAN: A bill (H. R. 10432) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Laird; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOGG: A bill (H. R. 10433) granting a pension to Marian Lee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10434) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Cunningham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 10435) granting a pension to Walter W. McGowen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KINZER: A bill (H. R. 10436) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Peters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LETTS: A bill (H. R. 10437) granting an increase of pension to Emeline J. Davison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN: A bill (H. R. 10438) granting a pension to John E. Quinn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10439) granting a pension to Carl L. Quinn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 10440) granting a pension to Julia A. Hopper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10441) granting a pension to Osborne Gun, alias Osman D. Gunn, alias O. D. Gunn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAGON: A bill (H. R. 10442) for the relief of Harry Roland Burgess; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 10443) for the relief of Joseph Sustowski; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10444) for the relief of Clarence Joseph Deutsch; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SINCLAIR: A bill (H. R. 10445) for the relief of Mike Mertes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 10446) granting a pension to Lula Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHITLEY: A bill (H. R. 10447) granting an increase of pension to Alice E. Bush; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODRUFF: A bill (H. R. 10448) granting a pension to Mrs. John Hindermeier; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5215. By Mr. BEERS: Petition of employees of the post office in Huntingdon, Pa., favoring the passage of Senate bill 15 and House bill 162; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

5216. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, opposing the calling of an international conference by the President of the United States, or the acceptance by him of an invitation to participate in such a conference, for the purpose of revising the present calendar, unless a proviso be attached thereto, definitely guaranteeing the preservation of the continuity of the weekly cycle without the insertion of the blank days; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5217. By Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa: Petition of the Iowa Joint Stock Land Bank of Sioux City, Iowa, protesting against damaging statements in regard to joint-stock land banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5218. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the New York post of the Society of American Military Engineers in support of such proposed legislation that will authorize the War Department to place educational peace-time orders with manufacturers as a step toward securing a reliable source of supply for vital items of equipment, munitions, and accessories for military service in an emergency; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5219. By Mr. COLTON: Petition of sundry citizens of Provo, Utah, asking for the passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

5220. By Mr. ESTEP: Petition of the Spanish War veterans requesting passage of House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

5221. Also, petition of physicians of McKeesport, Pa., and vicinity protesting against the passage of the Porter narcotic bills, H. R. 9053 and H. R. 9054; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5222. By Mr. GOLDER: Petition of 54 citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562 providing for increased rates of pension to the men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

5223. Also, petition of 67 citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562 providing for increased rates of pension to the men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

5224. By Mr. HESS: Petition of 32 citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, urging the passage of House bill 8976; to the Committee on Pensions.

5225. By Mr. HOGG: Petition of Spanish War veterans and other public-spirited citizens of Garrett, Ind., urging early enactment of legislation to increase pension paid to Spanish War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

5226. By Mr. HUDDLESTON: Petition of numerous residents of Jefferson County, Ala., in behalf of more liberal pensions for Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

5227. By Mr. KEARNS: Petition of Ira Shafer and 62 other residents of Portsmouth, Scioto County, Ohio, urging early con-

sideration and passage of House bill 2562 providing for increased rates of pension for Spanish War soldiers; to the Committee on Pensions.

5228. By Mr. KENDALL of Pennsylvania: Petition of certain citizens of Cambria and Somerset Counties, Pa., urging passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562 providing for increased rates of pensions for Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

5229. By Mr. McKEOWN: Petition of W. E. Goodwin and other citizens of Stratford, Okla., indorsing House bill 2968 providing for the pensioning of the regularly commissioned United States deputy marshals of the United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas, including the Indian Territory, now the State of Oklahoma, and to widows and dependant children of said marshals, and urging that the same be passed at the earliest possible moment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5230. Also, petition of C. L. Hart, of route 2, Byars, Okla., and other citizens of Byars, Okla., indorsing House bill 2968, providing for the pensioning of the regularly commissioned United States deputy marshals of the United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas, including the Indian Territory, now the State of Oklahoma, and to widows and dependent

children of said marshals, and urging that the same be passed at the earliest possible moment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5231. By Mr. McREYNOLDS: Petition of 76 voters from Tracy City, Grundy County, Tenn., urging the immediate passage of House bill 2562, for the relief of Spanish-American War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

5232. By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: Petition of Sons of the Revolution in the State of New York heartily indorsing the principal of military training in Reserve Officers' Training Corps and citizens' military training camps, and in high schools with Government aid; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5233. By Mr. REED of New York: Petition of Olean Aerie, No. 616, Fraternal Order of Eagles, indorsing House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

5234. By Mr. SPARKS: Petition of J. L. Bergin and 15 others, all of Bogue, Kans., for an increase in pension for veterans of the Civil War and for the widows of veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5235. By Mr. WOLFENDEN: Petition of residents of East Nantmeal Township, Chester County, Pa., requesting enactment of bills for increase of pension for Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.